In The Matter Of:

Brookline Zoning Board Appeals Hearing

PROCEEDINGS - Vol. 3 March 5, 2014

MERRILL CORPORATION

LegaLink, Inc.

101 Arch Street 3rd Floor Boston, MA 02110 Phone: 617.542.0039 Fax: 617.542.2119

Volume III

Pages 1-90

Brookline Zoning Board Appeals Hearing

Case Number 20130094

40B Application by Chestnut Hill Realty

The Residences of South Brookline

March 5, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.

Office of Town Counsel

333 Washington Street, 6th floor

Brookline, Massachusetts 02445

Merrill Corporation LegaLink, Inc

179 Lincoln Street, Suite 401

Boston, Massachusetts 02111

(617) 542-0039 Fax (617) 542-2119

Reporter: Kristen C. Krakofsky

	Page 2		Page 4
1	Appearances	1	PROCEEDINGS
2	Board Members	2	7:27 p.m.
3	Jessie Geller, Chairman	3	MR. GELLER: Good evening, everyone. I
	Jonathan Book	4	apologize for the delay. Unfortunately, the way it
	Chris Hussey	5	works is that if we lose a zoning member by his not
6	Mark Zuroff, Associate Member	6	being here, then they are lost for the rest of the
7	Avi Liss, Associate Member	7	proceedings and we'd rather have everybody available if
8		8	necessary. So I appreciate your patience.
9	Kathryn Cochrane Murphy, Esquire, Krokidas & Bluestein	9	One request that I have, we received a number
10	Edith M. Netter, Esquire,	10	of packages and a variety of materials through all
11	Edith M. Netter & Associates, P.C.	11	sorts of sources, and I would ask that for record
12	Joslin Murphy, Town Counsel	12	purposes that if there are future submittals, that they
13	Alison Steinfeld,	13	go via the Planning Department and in that fashion we
14	Planning & Community Development Director	14	can make certain that whatever is submitted gets copied
	Polly Selkoe, Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning	15	and circulated to all appropriate parties.
16	Paul Ford, Brookline Fire Chief	16	The second item for discussion is a question
17	Daniel O'Leary, Brookline Police Chief	17	that we received earlier in the week and this is with
	Peter Ditto, Director of Engineering and Transportation	18	respect to the applicant's request for waivers. The
	Pat Maloney, Assistant Director of Public Health,	19	matter of granting of waivers is a matter that is
	Chief of Environmental Health	20	within the jurisdiction of the Board. It will be
	Betsy DeWitt, Chairman of the Board of Selectmen	21	discussed and will be deliberated at a public hearing.
	Jim Batchelor, Chairman of the Preservation Commission	22	I think that the intent of prior conversations about it
	Kate Bowditch, Chairman of the Conservation Commission	23	is simply limited to the extent there were some
24	Mark Zarrillo, Chairman of the Planning Board	24	technical details, that those technical details might
	Page 3		Page 5
1	Roger Blood, Chairman of the Housing Advisory Board	1	be addressed so that we could have a coherent
2	Alan Morse, Chairman of the School Committee	2	discussion at the hearing.
3	Steven Schwartz, Esquire, Goulston & Storrs	3	Next item, I'd like to introduce Alison
4		4	Steinfeld, Planning Department head. Allison, I
5		5	understand there's been a preliminary meeting or
6		6	meetings?
7		7	MS. STEINFELD: Yes. I'm pleased to report
8		8	that the town staff and Chestnut Hill Realty met on
9		9	March 2nd to discuss whether or not work sessions would
10		10	be productive and if so, how it would proceed. Edie
11		11	Netter facilitated the meeting on behalf of the Town.
12 13		12 13	Chestnut Hill Realty provided a brief history of the
14		14	project and explained that the lot lines were drawn to avoid creating any new nonconformity. Town staff will
15		15	be reviewing that zoning analysis.
16		16	It was agreed that the meeting was productive
17		17	and that we would meet again on April 2nd to discuss
18		18	various design issues including the lot lines.
19		19	The intention of town staff is to have the
20		20	urban design peer review consultant on board and
21		21	available to participate at the April 2nd meeting.
22		22	Town staff recommends that the town team be
		23	expanded to include a representative of the Board of
23	I		

3

4

7

8

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

23

Page 6

public hearing, specifically on March 26th, focus on traffic and public safety in order to give the urban 3 design consultant sufficient time to complete his 4 report. Thank you.

MR. GELLER: Thank you. Board members, I'd like to take up a discussion about the order in which we hear the three focus points. They are design, traffic, and safety, and also drainage. Comments? Thoughts?

MS. BLANCHARD: I'd say, simply, just to make everything a little easier and flow, that if traffic and safety needs time, to extend it through the March 26th just to give them the time needed and meet in order of -- which makes more sense for each peer review to have their time to give us their opinion.

16 MR. GELLER: Mr. Hussey?

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

19

1

10

12

13

14

15

24

17 MR. HUSSEY: I'm glad to hear that we got a 18 peer review consultant on board.

MR. GELLER: But we don't.

20 MR. HUSSEY: We don't. But they will be on

21 board by the meeting on the 2nd of April; is that 22 right?

23

MR. GELLER: Yeah. I think this is an 24 important point, that in order to get somebody on

1 each one separately because they will be technical.

> MR. HUSSEY: All right. The point I wanted to raise tonight has to do with the terms that we've been using, "architectural design" and "planning." And I want to make clear that I think that the architectural elements, which are really the looks of the building, the style of the building, are not as important -because they are subjective, as it's been pointed out -- as the planning issues. And I hope the peer review is going to be devoted primarily to planning issues, which I think are objective, they're

up as questions. But just I wanted to make that clear. MR. GELLER: Yeah. I don't want to make a refinement today on what that would -- what would be involved. Do you want to speak to it?

quantifiable, they do relate to issues that have come

MS. STEINFELD: The request for quotations is currently drafted, distinguishing to some degree between site plan and building design. And because of the time constraints, the priority initially will be given to site plan and then we'll go into building.

MR. HUSSEY: So the site plan will involve the building as well?

MS. STEINFELD: It will address both. Peer

Page 7

board, they need time in order to give them the

opportunity to adequately review what exists. The 2

3 suggestion has been made that we -- if you remember the

discussion we had was that we would pursue design first

5 and then off of that everything else would flow. I

6 think the sense is that, given the time constraints,

7 that we move design to the second of the three focused

hearings and start the process with traffic and safety, 8

9 then go to design, and then go from there to drainage.

Now, the fact is that there is potential for some level of inconvenience. It's obvious. The 11 inconvenience is that to the extent that there are changes, then we may have to revisit, you know, traffic and safety.

On the other hand, there is the practical realty of giving peer review an adequate opportunity.

16 17 MR. HUSSEY: Also, I was wondering as well, is 18 it possible to have traffic and drainage peer review 19 reports in the same evening? It seems to me they're going to be fairly technical. I don't know how deep 20 21 into that technical business we're going to get, but if

22 that was possible, then we could have the design

23 consultant at the end of that.

MR. GELLER: Yeah. I think I'd rather hear

Page 9

Page 8

review will address both but just -- we do understand the difference between site design and building or 3 architecture design.

MR. HUSSEY: Okay. Thank you.

5 MR. GELLER: So that's -- anybody else have 6 any more comments on this -- the hierarchy?

MR. BOOK: Well, I think if more time is needed for the peer review at least than the urban design, we need to accommodate that. I think that's more than -- I think it's critical.

MR. GELLER: So what we're now proposing -our next hearing date is March 26th. So what we have been discussing was March 26th would have been the date dedicated to design, but we bumped traffic and safety up to that date. And then depending on peer review status on design, we would follow with design and then we would roll into drainage. Okay?

Okay. We're going to move on now to the primary purpose of tonight's hearing which is to hear testimony from town boards and commissions. I understand there are a number of presentations.

Let me reintroduce the members of the board so that if we have questions, you'll have probably no idea who's asking you the question. Avi Liss, all the way

3 (Pages 6 to 9)

12

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Page 10

Page 12

1 to the left, Jonathan Book, Chris Hussey, Mark Zuroff, and my name is Jessie Geller.

When you do your presentation, again, speak loudly and clearly. Start by giving us your name, your title. And we may have questions, so be patient with us.

7 Pat, had an order been set up? Who's speaking 8 first?

9 MS. MURPHY: Good evening, Chairman Geller, 10 Members of the Board. Joslin Murphy, Acting Town Counsel. 11

I'm appearing before you this evening to respond very briefly, I promise less than five minutes, to a number of assertions that the applicant has made 15 to you concerning the ongoing lawsuit pertaining to project eligibility and has been referred to now by both Mr. Talerman and by the applicant's counsel most recently in an email that he sent to you on February 26th. I don't intend to repeat what 20 Mr. Talerman offered at the last hearing, but rather to respond directly to the applicant's assertions.

22 First, in a correspondence to you, the 23 applicant's counsel referred to the Superior Court's 24 posture in the ongoing lawsuit. I have two points to

the site is not well mitigated. 1

2 In response to the applicant's second and 3 current application which eliminates the green belt to a greater degree than before, continues to propose still inadequate setbacks, and continues to propose a 6 one-story lower but still massive apartment building,

7 MassDevelopment approved this project stating simply

that it had made its finding. And you can see the stark contrast between its earlier determination and 10 its determination in the current case.

We respectfully suggest that MassDevelopment simply failed to meet its burden and its obligation under the regulations and had it done so, this project, as is currently designed, would not be proceeding under Chapter 40B.

As my final comment, the applicant has referred a number of times to an opinion of prior Town Counsel pertaining to the agreement that was reached by the original developer of the site and the Town in 1946 both in its presentation to you and counsel's email to you on February 26th.

So there is no misunderstanding, Town Counsel's opinion was based on information that was available to her at the time which did not include the

Page 11

Page 13

1 make in this regard.

3

4

5

6

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

First, the Court's sole ruling in this matter to date pertains to the Town's and the abutters' motion for injunctive relief, which I suspect you know carries a heightened standard of proof.

Second, we believe that the Court's ruling relied heavily, if not entirely, on the 2007 Appeals Court decision in the matter of Marion versus MassHighway and Finance Agency which preceded the current Chapter 40B regulations.

The issue is very simple. The current 12 regulations require subsidizing agencies to make 13 certain findings in determining project eligibility and to provide detailed reasoning behind these findings. 14 15 In this case, MassDevelopment simply failed to do 16 that.

17 MassDevelopment's failure to substantiate its 18 findings is highlighted in its response to the 19 applicant's initial application in 2012 which clearly 20 and unequivocally stated that the project was not 21 appropriate for the site due to the project's complete 22 elimination of the green belt, the inadequate setbacks, 23 and the massing of the large apartment buildings, which MassDevelopment itself believes is inappropriate. And

2011 Appeals Court decision in the Killorin matter.

2 You will note that in the material that the applicant's

3 counsel recently sent to you in late February, this

argument was not even addressed in the Court's 5 preliminary decision.

6 In conclusion, I respectfully state that the 7 Town is entitled to have this project reviewed fairly, appropriately, and in accordance with the law. And under the direction of the Board of Selectmen, my 10 office will continue to pursue a just result in this 11 regard. Thank you.

MR. GELLER: Thank you.

MS. MURPHY: The next speaker is Planning Director Alison Steinfeld.

MS. STEINFELD: Thank you. Alison Steinfeld, Planning Director.

The Town of Brookline has a proven record of

promoting, preserving, and developing affordable housing. An inclusionary zoning bylaw requires developers to allocate 15 percent of units to households with incomes under 100 percent of the area's median income.

Sings 1996, 96 affordable units have been created under Section 4.8 of the zoning bylaws. An

4 (Pages 10 to 13)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Page 14

1

- additional 7 units are currently under development.
- 2 The bylaw has also generated \$6.4 million in
- 3 contributions to the affordable housing trust fund.
- 4 That trust fund was created by the Town to invest
- municipal funds to affordable projects and to lend to

6 private development to create new units.

Since 1997 the fund has received \$11 million in revenues. The Town's free cash policy directs us to contribute municipal funds whenever the fund balance 10 falls below \$5 million. During this fiscal year alone, 11 the Town deposited \$555,000 to comply with that 12 policy.

13 We also historically have allocated a 14 significant portion of our annual federal allocation of

15 both the Community Development Block Grant and HOME

- 16 Funds to expand affordable housing opportunities,
- 17 improve existing units, and fund a housing office in
- 18 the Planning Department. That housing office
- 19 identifies opportunities to increase the affordable
- 20 housing supply and works closely with the Housing
- 21 Advisory Board.

7

8

9

8 9

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

22 We have formed successful partnerships with

23 private developers to create new subsidized units. The 24 Olmstead Hill Project created 24 affordable units, the

as a buffer zone between the garden-style development

- and the adjacent single-family homes. Instead, this
- 3 green swath of land with many mature trees on it will
- 4 be replaced by 12 new residential buildings. Some of

the buildings are 100 feet wide. And although the

6 buildings are much larger than single-family homes, the 7 setbacks that they're providing are much less than what

8 we have for a single-family home which would be

9 required to have a 50 percent greater setback.

Unfortunately, due to the setback area, the width of it, it will be impossible for the developer to plant large trees to screen and mitigate the new buildings. This is because the width is not very great and because of the grade of the setback, or the berm that they're proposing as well.

The apartment building, too, is out of scale. It ranges from 400 feet to 530 feet long. Imagine, for a minute, a football field. And half of that football field would be taken up by this proposed building.

It's also situated on a sensitive environmental spot, on a puddingstone outcropping and on the highest point of the site. From the lowest grade on Asheville Road, it will be 74 feet tall and it will be served by a narrow access driveway, Asheville

Page 15

Page 17

Page 16

- St. Aidan's Church Project created 36 affordable units,
- 2 and the Dummer Street Project, beginning to enter into
- 3 construction, will create 32 low-income units and
- rehabilitate an existing housing complex. Projects
- 5 such as the Olmstead Hill Project, St. Aidan's, and the
- 6 Dummer Street Projects are examples of how affordable
- 7 housing can be developed in a manner that is compatible

with sound planning and design principles.

Polly Selkoe, Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning, will discuss the proposed site design and how it fails to meet those principals.

12 MS. SELKOE: Polly Selkoe, Assistant Director 13 of Regulatory Planning.

At the last hearing on Hancock Village, the applicant made an assertion that design review is subjective. I disagree with that statement and believe that there is a set of design principles that most planners and design professionals agree on. Even the

- 19 State has issued design guidelines for 40B projects
- 20 which you see here on the slide. This project does
- 21 not -- as the town counsel has said, does not even meet 22 those state guidelines.
- 23 The two-and-a-half-story buildings have been located on the part of the site that was meant to serve

Road, which is only 18 feet wide. Cars from 116 more units will now be using Asheville and then accessing 3 Russett Road and the traffic on Russett Road will 4 double.

Because of the placement of the building, the circulation of the site is poor. There are dead ends and a hammerhead at the end of a long driveway, and this will impede emergency access. The fire chief, police chief, and director of traffic and engineering will comment tonight on this further and there will also be a consultant who will address these issues.

It's interesting to compare the development patterns and the amount of green space of the existing garden-style buildings to that of the proposed project. Here we have the existing development. This is just, of course, one part of the existing development. And here's the proposed development. And you can see that the open space of the existing development is much greater than that in the proposed development.

And I would just like to explain that under our bylaws, useable open space has a minimum dimension in each direction of 15 feet; the idea being that that means that both residents and children can play on that space. Landscaped open space is different. That can

5 (Pages 14 to 17)

Page 18 Page 20

be less than 15 feet. So we can see here that there's 2 very little useable open space.

3

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

17

18

19

20

21

22

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

The loss of mature trees not only impacts the ability to screen the project, but it also impacts the stormwater retention, and 50 percent of the site will either be impervious or not widely tested pervious surfaces, and this will also adversely affect the drainage on the site.

In conclusion, the site is poorly designed and will have many adverse impacts. The following speakers will speak more specifically to safety, traffic, health, and environmental issues.

13 Fire Chief Ford will speak next on emergency 14 fire access.

15 MR. FORD: Good evening. Paul Ford, Fire 16 Chief for Brookline.

I'd like to speak mainly with the response and the risk that's being taken with this new development. I'm charged with the protection of life safety and property for all the citizens of Brookline both current and future, and that also includes the safety of my men as they're on the scene of an emergency.

23 The new project, in a nutshell, adds 12 24 buildings -- two-and-a-half-story buildings -- some 1 citizens.

7

9

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

17

18

21

22

23

2 The NFPA has a standard on the response that 3 is geared towards limited personnel and timeliness. Fires today can double in size in as little as 30 seconds, so time is of the utmost that we get on 6 scene.

of the standards is having four men on the scene in four minutes, and we do that very well in Brookline. In fact, we averaged last year three minutes and thirty seconds on all of our runs. We can do that in this 12 development, and you'll see a map in a minute that shows distances we have to travel and time lines. We can have the four men on the scene in four minutes.

One of the standards -- one of the main tenets

The next major tenet of that standard says that I should have a full alarm assignment on the scene in eight minutes. Our full alarm assignment consists of eight engines and two ladder trucks and a deputy. The first ladder company and the third engine are 3.87 miles away and have a travel time of ten minutes.

So someone might think ten minutes, eight minutes, it's not a big deal. I would recommend to anyone to Google the NFPA's Countdown to Disaster. You will see a video clip of what happens in two minutes in

Page 21

a fire scene. I would recommend you do that.

So our first ladder and our third engine are already out of the time frame and the distance. Our second ladder truck is coming from 4.25 miles away. It's twelve minutes away.

Ladder companies are charged with forcible entry, ventilation, and search and rescue. That is their primary job, search and rescue. So the residents of this development -- of this proposed development they're going to be waiting ten minutes for the first company on the scene that's charged with their rescue. That's a long time in a fire.

The ISO, Insurance Service Office, which also creates standards for the fire departments in municipalities, they recommend a one-and-a-half-mile radius from the fire station for engine response and two miles for ladders. Again, on the next slide we'll see what that means in this development.

I would like to point out that we went for a tour of this facility, of the location, earlier in the fall sometime, and one of the representatives of the applicant -- excuse me. In the letter that he wrote, in the rebuttal that he wrote to the Town, "The applicant understands that the Town has a number of

four-car garages, a four-story apartment building with

2 144 underground parking spaces. They'll have 192 3

additional units, 402 additional bedrooms. And just as 4 an example, if we have an average of 1.5 persons per

bedroom, we're talking about 600 new residents in that neighborhood. This presents an increased life safety problem for the fire department.

The buildings themselves, as has already been noted, the setbacks are very small. That green space that is there currently offers a nice buffer for exposures. Radiant heat is the number 1 cause of 12 exposure fires, one fire burning from a building to the next building. We're going to have much tighter areas between buildings, large structures, and we're going to have more problems with exposure fires.

The tenets of firefighters throughout this country are first and foremost life safety. The second thing that we consider when fighting fire is exposure protection. That comes first. And we are going to add that problem to our needs and our emergency scenes here. We're going to have a problem with exposure protection. That takes manpower. It takes men right off the bat to stop this. So it is going to increase our workload and our problems in protecting these

6 (Pages 18 to 21)

1 options for ladder locations."

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I would say to you that for them to think that we should re-adjust our department and our deployment of companies to fit their needs would be inappropriate.

On this map you can see, these are our five different stations. The development in question is right here on this corner. Station 6 has engine 6. This is their one-and-a-half-mile circle. They're well 10 within the distance of getting there, that first 11 engine.

My first ladder truck is coming from this station here, and this green line is the two-mile radius of that ladder truck. As you can see, it's quite a distance from Hancock Village -- the Residences of South Brookline.

The second ladder truck has to come from Station 5. Their two-mile radius is all the way up here. So by ISO's standards, they are well out of position for the protection of this area.

21 Now, another comment that I heard -- I heard 22 firsthand when we were doing that walk-around and I 23 brought this up -- was what about other structures in 24 the area? There are other large developments, the

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Fall River. A firefighter was killed when an apparatus backing up ran him over. An adult, conscious of what was going on, was run over. If we go to an incident here with all our lights on and the excitement of 6 what's going on, we're going to have children all 7 around us. I don't want my men backing up apparatus

country that I can speak firsthand to in the City of

Page 24

Page 25

8 with children all around. It's a very dangerous 9 situation.

But we're going to have to back up to get out of here. Apparatus aren't even going to be able to get to this location. Those apparatus that the deputy releases, they may get called immediately to another scene, to your house, and they're stuck, stacked up in this area.

The same goes for almost all of these locations. Here we're coming into Independence Drive. Again, if we're all the way to this back building, my apparatus is stacked up in there. I'm not sure what the radius is around this or if they can make it with parked cars. Even if some go around, I'm going to have apparatus blocking this way. Again, getting out is going to be a problem, and I don't want apparatus 24 backing up.

1 The next location, same thing. You have to come down this road, drive all the way in here past

3 these garages. We're all stacked up in here, and

there's no turnaround. How are my apparatus and my men

5 going to get out of there? They're going to have to 6

back up.

13

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

7 In this last scene, we have the same situation 8 now here where we have to drive all the way down and it's down a big grade. I'm not sure if we're going to 10 be able to make it around this little circle. All the 11 same problems of backing up with our apparatus stacked 12 in there.

Now, the last comment I will mention that I heard when I brought this up -- I brought that hammerhead up on the location and I was told, "We've done that before many times in developments."

Well, I would say to you, the fire department used to use horses and we don't do that anymore. If you drive down Route 24 and you get off the exit to 44 in Taunton, you will find an extremely tight radius existing. You really have to slow down a lot, or you'll go right off of it. That's the way they built them 40 years ago. That was the standard. And we don't build them like that anymore. Times have

development at hand, the original development. There 2 are other locations there too. But I would say to you 3 that those are there. They were built. We don't need to add to the fire problem. We don't need to make our concerns worse and our protection more of an issue.

When we talk about the facility itself or the proposed development in this area, this first portion, we have a turnaround area that I was told is in place for fire apparatus as they'd be able to back up into it.

Well, first off, I have five apparatus coming to a reported fire in this building. They're all going to come down here and get all stacked up. I'm going to have a ladder truck right in the front of this building. That's our operation. And ambulance is going to be in first, a ladder truck, another engine.

When this fire is brought under control -- or this emergency. Maybe it wasn't even a fire. We got there and it was something minor and the deputy releases the last two companies. Those two companies are going to be stacked in here. They can't get to this turnaround. They're going to have to back up even with this. This requires apparatus to back up.

24 Now, something has happened all over this

7 (Pages 22 to 25)

1 changed.

2

3

4

6

7

8 9

I would say to you that a hammerhead-type turnaround where my men have to back up apparatus in a development like this that's going to be loaded with children is dangerous and I'm absolutely against that situation.

And with that, I'd like to introduce the Police Chief of Brookline, Chief O'Leary.

MR. GELLER: Does anybody have any questions?

10 MR. LISS: With the laser, could you show me, 11 with the existing structures, what is the protocol for a response now? 12

13 MR. FORD: These structures here?

14 MR. LISS: Yes.

15 MR. FORD: Well, there's no -- I believe 16 there's no access right here. That's green space. 17 They have to come down to the driveway, come around,

18 and drive in. Are they going to get in there and 19 stacked up and have to back up? Absolutely.

20 MR. LISS: So it's an existing problem?

21 MR. FORD: It's an existing problem. I don't

22 want to add to that. I would say that, you know, we've

23 learned some things in the past. And apparatus are

24 bigger than they ever were before, much longer, much

Page 29

Page 28

1 larger. I would say, again, we've learned from the 2 past. We used to do things that way, but I would not 3 promote that we continue to do things that way. 4 MR. LISS: Thank you.

5 MR. GELLER: Anything else?

6 (No response.)

7 Thank you.

8

9

MR. O'LEARY: Good evening. I'm Dan O'Leary, the Police Chief of Brookline. I listened to what

10 Chief Ford had to say, and I think I'd just like to add

one thing on the stacking and the boxing in. It's that 11

12 a lot of our responses not only have the fire

13 department going by themselves, it has the police and

14 ambulances. And I think it's critical that an

15 ambulance that has somebody injured in it has free

access into and out of some of these spaces. It's not 16

17 good when you get apparatus and vehicles blocking in an

18 emergency vehicle like an ambulance that has to make a

19 quick exit and get to a hospital. So that's another

20 concern on the part of his presentation.

21 When I took a look at this, I looked at the

22 fact that we were adding potentially 600 new residents

to the area and what that impact would have on some of

the streets that abut Hancock Village, especially

Independence Drive. And I'm sure all of us have been

up and down Independence Drive on many occasions and we

know that there's parking on both sides of the street,

that there's a traffic single at Beverly Road and

Independence, but then you don't get another one until

you get all the way down to Independence and VFW

7 Parkway. So there's a long stretch that is flat, it's

level, and a lot of cars go up and down it all hours of

It's an area where we've had a lot of

9

10

24

complaints today, as is, with the roadway and the 11 volume of cars that are on it, the volume of people 12 that are trying to cross it, and the volume of cars 14 that are turning into and out of the development. I 15 think when we start adding 500, 600 residents, families 16 into the area with cars and more people walking around and young children, we're going to have many more 17

concerns and many more complaints of the cars speeding 18

19 in the area there.

20 I think one thing that's critical is the location of the crosswalks that are currently there. I

don't think that they're in the best places when the 23 construction, if it's approved, gets completed.

And one area I'd like to point out is the road

that would be going in opposite -- just about opposite

2 Gerry Road. If you were going to come out and use that 3 crosswalk, that new proposed road, they will come out

and they will be right at the crosswalk. I think that

5 any kind of study that has to be done has to take into 6

account the best locations to have their residents

7 there cross the street.

8 I think when you take a look at the crosswalks or the crossings that are there now, they are no longer 10 going to be adequate. I think anybody that is going to 11 do any kind of work up there is going to have to look to install signals at those intersections. You would 13 have cars not only entering onto Independence Drive, 14 but you would also have them exiting off. You will 15 have a lot of people crossing, including children going to the Baker School, and I think all that has to get

17 taken into consideration and crosswalks alone will no 18 longer be safe for people to walk across the street.

I think one other thing that has to be taken into account is that now is the time to take a look at the parking that's up there with the addition of roadways going into the development. You're going to have to eliminate some of the parking that currently takes place along Independence Drive. They're going to

8 (Pages 26 to 29)

19

21

have to make sure that there's enough site lines for cars entering and exiting out of their development, and 3 you have to make sure that the people that are going to 4 be using the roadway across the street can do it in a

5 safe manner.

22

1

2

3

5

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

6 Finally, with the volume of potential children 7 going to the Baker School, we have one crossing guard now that works the intersection of Beverly and 8 Independence Drive. That one person probably will not 9 10 be sufficient. I think it's difficult, and I know 11 we've had that experience in other locations in town, that people will pick the most convenient place, not 12 13 necessarily the most safe place to cross. And I think 14 an addition of a crossing guard in one of these

proposed crosswalks getting people across Independence 15 15 16 Drive will be a necessity during the school season. 17 And that's all I'd like to add at this point.

18 And if there's no questions, I'd like to introduce the 19 next speaker which is Peter Ditto to talk about the 20 traffic and stormwater.

MR. GELLER: Thank you, Chief. 21

MR. DITTO: Good evening. My name is Peter

23 Ditto. I'm the Director of Engineering and

24 Transportation, and first off I'd like to thank you for

Page 32

to abutters' property. Again, based on internal data,

3 Russett Road has a current average daily trips, ADT, of

and low speed since they are primarily used as access

4 400 vehicles per day.

5 Currently Hancock Village has 143 parking 6 spaces which only access is Asheville and Russett

7 Roads. The proposed development will add an additional

234 parking spaces for a total of 377 vehicles parked

on-site. With the potential of two trips per day, one

in and out, that is an increase of 468 vehicle trips on Asheville and Russett Road. This does not include

12 visitors, trades men, and additional trips per vehicle.

That 468 additional vehicles trips amounts to almost a

14 100 percent increase of the average daily trips.

Bullet Number 3: Traffic calming measures required to ensure pedestrian and traffic safety. The proposed project calls for uses of two additional curb cuts on Independence Drive but ingress and egress for residents of Buildings 1 through 7.

20 Updated data provided by the Brookline Police Department includes 31 reported motor vehicle accidents

22 between 2009 and 2013 on Independence Drive and Grove

Street from the town line to South Street, 52 percent, 23

24 16 of 31, occurring in the vicinity of existing curb

Page 31

18

19

1

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

Page 33

giving us this opportunity to express our concerns.

I've got four bullet points with respect to

traffic that I'd like to address, the first one being the history of accidents on Independence and the

potential for more. Independence Drive is a four-lane

6 urban peninsular arterial which currently serves 7

somewhere between 13 to 15 thousand vehicles per day, and that's based on interior traffic counts.

There are two existing crosswalks across Independence Drive which serve pedestrians connecting between the two sides of Hancock Village. Pedestrians must cross approximately 50 feet across four lanes of traffic which has an 85th percentile speed of 30 miles per hour. And, again, that's taken from internal data.

15 Brookline Police accident data indicates more traffic accidents have occurred between 2009 and 2011 16 17 at all the intersections along this corridor. 18 Specifically, the accident data indicates that there is 19 a pedestrian safety issue at the existing midblock

20 crosswalks that serve Hancock Village. 21 Bullet 2: Two to three times increased 22 traffic volume on Asheville and Russett Roads. Both 23 Asheville and Russett Roads are classified as local roadways. Local roadways typically have low volumes cuts by Hancock Village.

2 Staff is concerned that additional access 3 points will result in increased motor vehicle

accidents, and at a minimum the development should be

required to provide mitigation and changes to

Independence Drive to be approved by the Transportation

7 Board for the Town of Brookline to ensure vehicular,

cyclist, and pedestrian safety on Independence Drive.

Similar to Independence Drive, at a minimum, the developer should be required to provide mitigation and changes to Russett Road to be approved by the Transportation Board for the Town of Brookline to ensure, again, vehicular, cyclist, and pedestrian safety.

Required transportation demand management with monitoring, the last bullet there. The traffic consultant indicated that in order to reduce the impact of a new development, the new residents will have to access the existing transportation demand management programs currently in effect including shuttle service to the MBTA station and up to two Zipcar locations on-site. There's no intention stated to increase the amount of frequency of these services.

In order for the transportation demand

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 34

Page 36

management services to be effective, they must be 2 convenient and available when residents want them. The 3 increase of 192 units of one, two, three, and four

4 bedroom units and the anticipated increase in usage will diminish the effectiveness of the existing TDM 6 services.

Zipcars' internal policy is to increase the number of vehicles at a location where the utilization exceeds 40 percent. With respect to the two current vehicles on-site, the utilization rate is 30 percent 11 with a projected TDM of -- I'm sorry, the projected increase in residents -- the developer should be 12 13 required to double that number of on-site vehicles to 14 four and locate them along either Asheville Road or 15 Thornton Road within the development to make them 16 easily accessible.

In terms of shuttle service, again, with the increase in residents, the developer should be required to increase both the capacity of the shuttle and increase the frequency throughout the day, especially during peak commuting hours.

22 Similarly to the Cities of Cambridge and 23 Somerville, the developer should have to sign a TDM 24 agreement with the Town which includes a modern train

adverse effects of soil erosion and sedimentation in an environmentally public/health and municipal -- I'm 3 getting old.

4 Okay. The purpose of this section is to eliminate or reduce the adverse effects of soil erosion 6 and sedimentation on nearby public welfare and health 7 at municipal facilities. 8

Postconstruction stormwater management. The purpose of this section is to establish minimum requirements and controls to protect and safeguard the environment, natural resources, and general health from adverse impacts of the stormwater.

To achieve this purpose, the following actions must be put in place: Minimize stormwater runoff from any development, minimize nonpoint source pollution caused by the stormwater runoff, and provide the groundwater recharge where appropriate.

Moving on to the MassDEP stormwater management standards, Standard Number 1, no untreated discharge. "Treated systems" refers to stormwater management systems that are specifically designed to achieve sediment and contaminant treatment removal that adequately protects groundwater, surface water, and wetlands.

Page 35

Page 37

1 program.

7

8

9

10

17

18

19

20

21

6

8

10

2 That completes the presentation on traffic. I 3 can stop here and answer any questions or continue with 4 the stormwater.

5 MR. GELLER: Questions?

MR. LISS: Real quick. What is TDM, again?

7 MR. O'LEARY: Traffic demand management.

MR. LISS: Traffic demand management.

9 MR. O'LEARY: Moving forward with stormwater. There are two regulations that the Town uses

11 to evaluate stormwater programs. The first is the 12 Town's stormwater bylaw, and the second is MassDEP 13 stormwater management standards. The Town -- the DPW expects that there will be full compliance with town 14

15 stormwater management and MassDEP stormwater 16 standards.

17 I'll just briefly go through what all this 18 means. Some of them are obvious, some of them not so 19 much. But starting at the top, discharges to the 20 municipal drainage system. That provides -- the

21 purpose of that section is to eliminate nonstormwater 22 discharges to the Town's storm drain.

23 The second one, erosion sediment control. The purpose of this section is to eliminate or reduce the

1 Peek rate attenuation. Stormwater management 2 systems shall be designed so that postdevelopment peak 3 discharge rates do not exceed predevelopment discharge rates for 2-, 10-, and 100-year 24-hour storms. Best 5 management practices, BMGs, must be in place to meet 6 this standard.

Number 3, recharge. Loss of annual recharge to groundwater shall be eliminated or minimized by use of environmentally sensitive site design.

Water quality. Stormwater management systems shall be designed to remove 80 percent of average annual postconstruction load of total suspended solids, TSS.

Number 5, land use with higher potential pollution loads. The land uses with higher potential pollution loads, source control, and pollution prevention shall be implemented to eliminate or reduce the discharge of stormwater runoff from such land use as the maximum extent possible.

Critical areas. Stormwater discharges within an internal well here, that's the critical area. Protection to area of a public water supply requires the use of a specific source control measure.

Redevelopment. Projects classified as

10 (Pages 34 to 37)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

19

21

22

23

24

2

Page 38

Page 40

- redevelopment can meet standards at varying levels. In some cases, it's to the maximum extent possible. If a 3 project is classified as new construction, the 4 standards must be met fully. This project here is
- 5 classified as a new construction. 6 Number 8, construction period pollution 7 prevention and erosion and sediment control. A plan to 8 control construction-related impacts including erosion and sedimentation during construction activities must

10 be developed and implemented.

9

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

Operation and maintenance plan. A long-term 12 operation and maintenance plan shall be developed and implemented to ensure that stormwater systems function as designed.

And finally, prohibition of illicit discharges. All illicit discharges to the stormwater management system are prohibited. Case closed.

And in summary, I'd just like to say, for 19 utilities in general, DPW expects that the developer 20 will evaluate the capacity of the existing sewer and 21 drain's ability to handle peak rate discharges. We 22 also expect they dye test existing sewer and drain 23 services for illicit connection detection and finally,

of this project, there should be an O&M specifically

for porous pavement and then I think it's going to need

3 a lot of special attention.

4 MR. GELLER: Other questions?

(No response.)

6 Thank you.

> MR. DITTO: I'd like to introduce Pat Maloney with health issues.

MR. MALONEY: Good evening. My name is Pat Maloney. I'm the Assistant Director of Public Health and the Chief of Environmental Health for the Town of Brookline

As the Board should have, previously I submitted a memorandum outlining the Health Department's concerns as well as support documents from our CO control contractor. And basically, two concerns I'd like to mention this evening and as our engineer previously noted, stormwater and the water activity is of concern. And it's of great concern to the Health 20 Department.

We have the challenge of combating mosquitos during the spring and summer season, and stormwater and catch basin situations contribute to our challenge in addressing the mosquitos. The types of mosquitos that

Page 41

1 of the sewer on Independence Drive which will include 2 videoing the line.

Thank you. That concludes my presentation.

24 conduct an I&I, that's inflow and infiltration study,

MR. ZUROFF: Mr. Ditto, you have illuminated all the standards that the developer has to meet, but have you reviewed their proposal and their design to see whether they have, at least in theory, met these standards?

MR. DITTO: They did submit a stormwater study, and I did a preliminary review, and they touched all 10 standards. And from what I can bring from that, they're not asking for any variance for noncompliance.

MR. ZUROFF: Okay. Thank you.

MR. GELLER: Mr. Ditto, do you have a comment, first in general about porous pavement and second, the use of porous pavement in this project?

17 MR. DITTO: We did a sample porous pavement 18 surface in the Fuller Street parking lot. It was a 30 19 by 30 pilot program, and I observed it last year, and it functioned fine. I haven't gone back this year to 20 21 see what was happening.

22 Concerns with porous pavement are that I 23 believe they have a limited lifetime. I don't know what that is but I would say at the very least, as part are of concern that are vectors in public health, that

we're concerned about in public health and controlling, 3 are ones that are associated with standing water

environments associated with catch basins as well as

5 mosquitos associated with wetlands.

6 And as we see the project here now and the 7 scale contractor confirms, we're concerned about those impacts, so it's important to us that what plans are 9 finally submitted and fine tuned, that they address

10 these issues. And we have some firm comments of how

11 they're addressing these so we're not increasing

stormwater issues or having a real challenge with 13 catch basins. We have over 3,000 catch basins now that

14 we need to treat, and there will most likely be many

15 more in this environment. So that's a public health 16

concern.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

In this area we have -- we set mosquito monitors throughout the town and we've had monitors in this area of town and we have found EEE. So in previous testing, and we'll continue our testing, this is an area where we have found the EEE mosquito, so it is of concern and it's a target focus for us in the Public Health Department.

The other issue is rubbish control. As you

3

Page 42

know, we have a large population there now, a number of

- dwelling units, a large number of dwelling units, and
- 3 we'll be adding more apartments to that. Previously,
- 4 the facility was managed with dumpsters. Dumpsters
- proved to be a problem. They evolved to add compactors and the compactors have been much better, not perfect,
- 7 but much, much better. They have pickups three times a

8 week, and it serves the current population there. 9

- Adding the additional homes and the additional 10 dwellings is of concern to us, and we'd like to see
- 11 firm plans of what the rubbish management will be, how
- it will be handled, what kind of pickups are they 12
- 13 envisioning, where will it be stored, how will it
- 14 impact the neighborhoods that are in that area. So
- 15 we'd like to see that in -- so that we're comfortable
- 16 with it.
- 17 If rubbish is out of control, it leads to
- 18 rodent problems, insect problems, and wildlife issues
- 19 and we've had those challenges up in that part of
- 20 town. So it's of concern to the Health Department that
- 21 these are adequately addressed so that we're
- 22 comfortable that they don't become nuisance conditions
- 23 and problems for the Health Department.
- 24 Any questions?

Page 44

- In addition, it is inefficient. It uses land in a way that's inconsistent with the Commonwealth's
- sustainable development principles, specifically
- principles that promote cohesive, efficient, and
- coordinated development that is "compact, conserves
- 6 land, protects historic resources, and integrates 7
 - uses."

8 Furthermore, the existing environment is

- 9 officially eligible for designation in the National
- Register of Historic Places. That eligibility is
- 11 attributed primarily to the distinctive character of 12
 - the site plan.
- 13 Intrinsic to the existing housing complex is
- 14 the respect for the topography, environment, and
- 15 residents. Natural resources are integrated into the 16 plans. Beautifully designed, maintained, and useable
- 17 green space is a paramount land use, pedestrian
- circulation takes precedence over vehicular
- 19 circulation, and a sense of community and livability is
- 20 dominant. The site plan before us undermines those
- 21 characteristics.
- 22 That being said, the Planning Department,
- 23 under the direction and support of the Town
- 24 Administrator and the Board of Selectmen is pleased to

Page 43

8

14

Page 45

- 1 MR. GELLER. Questions?
- 2 (No response.)
- 3 No. Thank you.
- 4 MR. MALONEY: Thank you. And next will be
- 5 Allison Steinfeld following up.
 - MR. GELLER: Thank you.
- 7 MS. STEINFELD: Alison Steinfeld, again,
- 8 Planning Director.

6

9

- As you can see from the range of departments
- 10 providing compelling testimony this evening, a
- 11 development proposal involves a network of interrelated
- 12 functional areas: public safety, emergency access,
- 13 environmental resources, public health, and integration
- 14 of a project into the surrounding neighborhood.
- 15 The extent to which a development plan
- 16 supports rather than detracts from that network depends
- 17 on the success of the site plan's design. That is how
- 18 well the design functions, not solely how it appears
- 19 visually.
- The flaws that we have identified are 20
- 21 fundamental and as a result generate adverse conditions
- 22 and impacts that are challenging and perhaps impossible
- 23 to mitigate. Simply put, the design of the proposed
- project is not appropriate for the site.

- join all appropriate departments to work with the
- applicant to develop a design that respects the
- 3 applicant's priorities while at the same time
- reconciling those priorities with those of the Town.
- 5 I'm therefore pleased to introduce Betsy
- 6 DeWitt, Chairman of the Board of Selectmen, who will
- 7 speak to the Board's priorities. Thank you.
 - MR. GELLER: Thank you.
- 9 MS. DEWITT: Hi. I'm Betsy DeWitt and on
- 10 behalf of the Board of Selectmen I want to confirm the
- 11 Board's position on Chestnut Hill Realty's application
- for a comprehensive permit. And I want to mention two
- - particular issues; one is affordable housing progress
 - and the other is site design suitability.
- 15 Under affordable housing and the strange math
- of 40B, the Town's current subsidized housing inventory 17 count is 2,118 units and there are about 78 more in the
- 18 pipeline. Several were mentioned earlier. That's out
- 19 of the total number of units in the town as determined
- by the 2010 census of 26,200, so that's the
- 21 denominator. In terms of the 40B, that's about 8
- 22 percent, and the goal from the Town would be 10 percent
- under the statute. However, this calculation includes 200 market-rate units, so actually only 1,918 are

12 (Pages 42 to 45)

Page 48

1 really affordable.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

13

14

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

On the other hand, if the inventory included additional affordable units that are not counted because they serve residents up to 110 percent of the area median income and the 300 Federal Section 8 housing vouchers which are sited in Brookline and occupied by Brookline residents are counted, the Town would have a total of 2,337 affordable units, no market-rates, and would be at 9 percent in the statistics as compiled under 40B.

Under 40B, Brookline would have to create 500 additional affordable units in order to be compliant, and this is just simply not feasible in a built-out community. We don't have the available vacant land.

If affordable was a real goal for this project, we would commit to work with the Brookline Housing Authority and site as many as possible of the additional 300 authorized Section 8 vouchers for Brookline and Hancock Village.

Instead we have a proposal for 153 market-rate units plus 39 affordable units that, according to the strange math of 40B, will equal 192 affordable units as counted by the subsidized housing inventory. And that would then give us a new total including 353

building massing, impacts on topography, environmental

resources, inadequate setbacks, and complete

3 elimination of the green belt buffer, have remained the 4

same.

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

20

21

22

6

7

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

5 As you can see from the image, the footprint 6 and ground coverage of the second proposal is virtually identical to the first one and contains all the same design characteristics and is, quote, not generally 9 appropriate for the site, as will be further detailed 10 by presentations tonight.

It is our position that the applicant has had the opportunity to correct the design and safety flaws that have been identified but has chosen not to make any meaningful changes. The selectmen vigorously and 15 unanimously assert that the current proposed development of Hancock Village is poorly conceived and undermines the characteristics and the underlying philosophy that in 1946 established Hancock Village 19 with the support and cooperation of the Town.

Hancock Village has been determined to be eligible for the National Register of Historic places as a planned garden community and has stood for years as a testament to a collaborative effort by all parties who were involved in the original design with

Page 47

Page 49

market-rate units with only 1,957 actual affordable units. I cannot do this math.

Now we're going to move to site suitability. A year ago, MassDevelopment drafted a preliminary eligibility letter that determined that Chestnut Hill Realty's first conceptual proposal design for Hancock Village was not consistent with the design requirements as mentioned earlier by acting Town Counsel Murphy.

That letter states, "The design is not generally appropriate for the site due to the project's complete elimination of the existing green belt buffer 12 between the current Hancock Village residences and the abutting sing-family neighborhood homes, the project's inadequate setbacks, and the massing of the project's 15 proposed tall buildings which is generally inappropriate for the site and not well mitigated on topography or other needs. As a result, the proposed 18 design of the project does not integrate well into the surrounding development pattern and therefore is not generally appropriate for the site."

Coincidentally, the original application was withdrawn and a second application was submitted. Somewhat mysteriously, the second application was approved while all the original design factors,

significant areas of open space, integration of natural 2 resources into the site plan, and separation of 3 pedestrian and vehicular uses. The applicant has chosen the least appropriate locations on the property 5 for the proposed new structures.

The Board of Selectmen is convinced that new residential development with additional affordable housing can be incorporated into the existing patterns of both Hancock Village and the surrounding neighborhoods while preserving the very qualities that make Hancock Village a prototype for a well-designed residential community.

If the ZBA considers approving the proposed development, it should do so only with conditions. Accordingly, the Board of Selectmen urges the Board of Appeals to provide additional affordable housing and to protect the character of Hancock Village by preserving community open space and protecting the natural resources both within and adjacent to the complex and we recommend the following properties to be considered for any future development:

First, that the green belt must be retained as open space and mature shade trees must be protected. A conservation easement could be easily established that

13 (Pages 46 to 49)

б

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

3

5

6

7

8

10

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

23

Page 50

Page 52

would eliminate the concern that that land is assessed and taxed and if it could be developed for single-family homes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

New development must protect rather than destroy the historic architectural and natural qualities of Hancock Village including, but in no way limited to, the puddingstone outcroppings.

Any new buildings should be well designed and harmonious with the neighboring architecture in both scale and detailing. Any multistory buildings should be sited and articulated to mitigate and minimize visual impact on the existing neighborhood.

Any and all potential negative traffic circulation, public safety, stormwater, and drainage impact on both Hancock Village residents and abutting and nearby properties and roadways must be identified and mitigated by the applicant.

And finally, following the goals of 40B and consistent with local needs, at least 53 Federal Section 8 housing vouchers, either site-based or mobile, should be required to be distributed among the existing 350 units at Hancock Village to add affordable units that would be equal to 10 percent for the whole complex and to promote diversity.

the Mass. Historical Commission in 2012 based upon the 1

integrity of the site and its outstanding

3 characteristics.

> The first and largest garden village housing development in the region, Hancock Village, built between '46 and '49, is significant in part for the collaborative planning project involving the Town of Brookline, the City of Boston, and John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Company to provide housing for returning World War II veterans and their families.

The housing complex represents an important convergence of garden city planning ideals and Federal Housing Authority principles and practices of the 1930s and '40s. It's also an early example of an insurance company owning and developing real estate.

National and prominent designers and firms such as project manager Gustave Ring, architect Louis Justement, and the Olmstead Associates of Brookline 19 played key roles in planning the housing complex. The planning that underlies the Hancock Village development is historic but beyond being historic, these practices and principles are still at the core of current best practices as demonstrated by much of the testimony here 24 earlier tonight.

Page 51

Page 53

The Board of Selectmen stands ready to work with the Board of Appeals and the applicant to assign municipal officials, staff, and resources to efforts to improve the overall design of the project. And if the applicant were to refuse to engage in constructive discussions, the Board will vigorously oppose a comprehensive permit.

Thank you.

MR. GELLER: Thank you.

MS. STEINFELD: That concludes the first component of the Town's presentation. With your permission, I would like to introduce Jim Batchelor, Chairman of the Preservation Commission.

MR. BATCHELOR: Thank you. My name is Jim Batchelor. I'm a resident of Manchester Road, and I'm the Chair of the Brookline Preservation Commission. I'm also a member of the Neighborhood Conservation District Commission.

19 One of the charges of the Brookline 20 Preservation Commission is to identify and protect the 21 Town's cultural resources. We have identified Hancock

22 Village as a resource valuable to the Town and the

23 Commonwealth. It was voted eligible for the National

Register and the State Register of Historic Places by

1 The site development principles embodied in 2 Hancock Village were based on functional, safety-based traffic patterns recognizing the growing importance of the automobile and principles of contemporary living in moderate-density communities. Vehicles flow from the major roads like Independence Drive onto secondary roads like Thornton.

An exception is to the limited set of parking spaces that are accessed from Asheville, which is a small, local road. The new development proposal attempts to turn that small, local road into a primary circulation spine serving an extremely high percentage of the proposed 192 new units. This makes no sense from the viewpoint of safety of pedestrians or drivers in Hancock Village or on the surrounding streets. That traffic pattern should be considered unacceptable. There are other locations within Hancock Village that can better accommodate this traffic.

Similarly, the green space buffer plays a functional role in the life of the community as well as an environmental role. In this proposal, the buffer is virtually completely paved or built over, ending its environmental and community value.

In addition to basic sound traffic and open

14 (Pages 50 to 53)

1

- space site development principles, the original garden
- village apartment design provides a carefully
- 3 constructed relationship between roadways, parking,
- 4 front entry sequences, the units themselves, and
- semi-private open spaces out back. All of these
- 6 qualities contribute to the quality of community at
- 7 Hancock Village, but they are ignored or damaged in the
- 8 proposed site plan.

9

10

11

12

13

14

I want to go through a couple slides. So this is the existing conditions, obviously, with the Boston part showing in white and this is Independence, the primary road down through here. Note, obviously, the green buffer here and the green space in the center which is the location for the new apartment buildings.

15 This is what's been proposed and talked 16 about. Notice that all of this area here, as has been 17 mentioned by others, is being accessed through 18 neighborhood streets. There's no reason why this 19 development, if there is an increase in density, should 20 not be accessed off Independence and associated 21 streets. It seems totally logical to make that basic

22 precept of any plan changes. 23 So the photograph of the green space buffers,

24 I think you can see, not only do they look good, they

apartment building, and there is an attempt to reduce

- the massing of this apartment building, but it's done
- 3 with an enormous amount of excavation. This top line
- 4 is the existing grade. This is the amount of
- excavation that would have to go on. The height of
- 6 excavation is greater than the height of the existing
- 7 buildings. Much of that is puddingstone and will not easily be taken out of the ground.

9 I think that there should be consideration not 10 only to preserve the quality of the puddingstone as an 11 amenity but to what would represent a considerable 12 burden on anybody living nearby when this is attempted 13 to be removed or the effect on the roads when the

14 trucks hall this out. So I do think there are lot a of 15 impacts in this that need to be carefully looked at.

16 Obviously, Brookline is a town that wants to 17 welcome affordable housing. This is a significant 18 piece of real estate. I hope there is a constructive

19 way to proceed. Thank you.

2.0 MR. GELLER: Thank you.

MR. HUSSEY: Mr. Batchelor, I have a 21 22 question. Could you go back to the site plan that

showed the shades of green? 23 24 MR. BATCHELOR: Sure.

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

20

21

22

23

Page 57

Page 56

- have mature trees on them. And in spite of the fact
- 2 that you can, in fact, put stormwater drainage in pipes
- 3 and it can work, this is certainly not in the spirit of
- the best practices today or the best practices in the 4
- 5 1940s. These open spaces provide many functions that
- pipes alone cannot replace. As you can see, these
- 7 spaces are also extensively used for community
- 8 activities.

9

16 17

18

19

20

This is a nice shot of the entry sequence.

10 Essentially, people park their cars on the principle roads and they access their front doors through a

11 12 shared open space. Two nice photographs there. And

13 that's a pattern throughout Hancock Village, and

there's no reason why that pattern, again, should not 14

15 be continuable.

> These are on the other side of the units, the semiprivate open space that's on the back side. Again, defined small areas associated with units giving out to larger open spaces that people can use for passive circulation or informal activities.

21 I'll jump over this slide. I think Polly did 22 a good job covering it earlier.

23 One last slide to point out. This is the area of the apartment building -- this represents the

1 MR. HUSSEY: The first one you had up. And could you explain for the Board -- you've got a variety 2 of different shades of green. Could you differentiate -- I know the buffer is the bright green.

MR. BATCHELOR: The buffer is bright. I didn't make this map, but I'm going to guess the following: This more olive colored is probably an area that has outcroppings and may not be easily used in an open way.

The lightest green here I believe represents the access to the front doors.

The medium green here I believe represents passive areas that are behind the buildings. They're probably, as you saw in the photographs, little areas that people have set up so that they have, like, a private patio and then that essentially blends out to passive open space.

MR. HUSSEY: Okay. Thank you. And one other question. Has there actually been application made to a listing on the historic site -- on the National Park Service?

MR. BATCHELOR: Can I get help?

MR. HUSSEY: There was something in one of these reports that indicated that an application had

15 (Pages 54 to 57)

13

14

15

16

17

20

22

23

10

11

13

14

17

18

19

21

23

general.

1 been made, but ...

7

1

2

3

5

6

7

9

11

13

17

19

20

2 MR. BATCHELOR: I can guess at this but if 3 there is someone who is knowledgeable, they should 4 speak up. I see someone standing who might be more 5 knowledgeable than I on this. 6 MR. HUSSEY: Thank you.

MR. DeWitt: Dennis DeWitt, member of the NCDC and a member of the Mass. Historical Commission.

8 9 To the best of my knowledge, a specific 10 application for a listing hasn't been made on the 11 assumption that -- and I could be corrected -- on the 12 assumption that it would be not accepted by the 13 applicant. But the effect is that when something is 14 deemed eligible by the State, that has the same effect 15 in law and -- regulatory law -- as if it was on the 16 National Registry. MR. HUSSEY: Thank you. 17

18 MS. STEINFELD: Kate Bowditch, Chairman of the

19 Conservation Commission.

20 MS. BOWDITCH: Good evening and thank you.

21 I'm Kate Bowditch, Chair of the Conservation

22 Commission. I'm a resident of Cushing Road, and I'd

23 like to thank the Board for affording the Conservation

24 Commission the opportunity to review and provide you

Page 59

Page 61

Page 60

with our feedback on the application.

Our Commission has reviewed the plans with particular focus on the disciplines of engineering, hydrology, and the protection of wetland resource areas under our jurisdiction. I would like to echo some of the comments that you've heard already this evening about stormwater and the concern and importance of the design of the stormwater management on the site to the Town, to the Charles River Watershed, and indeed to the 10 State.

The site is of particular importance because 12 it does drain directly into the D. Blakely Hoar Sanctuary. Runoff from the site flows to wetland 14 resource areas which are protected under municipal and 15 state laws. Currently the runoff receives very minimal treatment because of the age and design of this 16 development. So we do, as a conservation commission as 18 well as with the Town working with the engineering department, have quite a bit of historic information about the impact of the drainage on the site.

21 Water and wetland resources at the sanctuary 22 are critical environmental resources for the Town of 23 Brookline, as I mentioned, the Charles River Watershed. and the State of Massachusetts. These resources are to

be protected for their irreplaceable value and benefits

including flood protection, water quality, groundwater

3 recharge, habitat, not to mention aesthetics, public

health, and the general good feeling about our

community. Any new development that discharges

6 directly into the sanctuary is a major concern and 7

requires significant review and analysis.

8 In general, the Conservation Commission feels 9 there are numerous opportunities to reduce the impact 10 of the new development as well as to reduce the 11 existing impact of the existing development on the 12 sanctuary and on those resources.

The Commission has several specific concerns which were detailed in our comment letter to you. I would like to note that serving with me as vice chair of the Conservation Commission is Marcus Quigley who is a professional stormwater engineer and a great resource to the Town and to our Commission and he assisted in the review of the project's stormwater design and in preparing the comments that we submitted to you as well as my brief remarks this evening.

Two concerns that I would like to mention in particular, one that you've already asked Mr. Ditto about which is the heavy reliance in the proposed

project on porous asphalt for complying with standards and reducing the impacts of the project, particularly

3 with regard to stormwater runoff.

The assumption is that the material will maintain its porosity for many years to come. I would like to note, the Conservation Commission is strongly 7 supportive of the use of porous asphalt in certain conditions, so my remarks are not intended to imply 9 that we're opposed to the use of porous asphalt in

However, we are concerned that the proposed project uses porous asphalt in areas where it may not be appropriate, where it may become clogged and lose its functionality over time. This would be particularly true if there is not rigorous operation and maintenance performed on the porous asphalt. In order to maintain porosity, the pore spaces must remain open. There is general maintenance required, including vacuum sweeping with a vacuum sweeper to remove fine particles that can potentially clog the surfaces.

Because the project design currently relies very heavily on porous asphalt to comply with the stormwater requirements and to reduce the impact, having a robust operation and maintenance plan is

16 (Pages 58 to 61)

1 obviously critical and -- as well as ongoing monitoring 2 to ensure that the porosity of the surface is intact.

There are few opportunities for residents, site managers, or maintenance personnel to know whether the porosity of porous pavement is intact, and if we're losing it, how much we're losing. And, again, as I mentioned earlier, because this property does discharge directly into the D. Blakely Hoar Sanctuary, this is of

very high concern for the Conservation Commission. An additional concern that I would like to 11 mention is the addition overall of flow into the storm drain itself which discharges into the sanctuary. This 13 storm drain has been a source of intermittent 14 discharges of sewage and other pollutants which have 15 been identified on and off over the past several 16 years. Until these problems are identified in terms of

17 the source of where these pollutants are coming from

18 and they're corrected and it's been confirmed that a 19 fix is in place, the Commission feels it's

20 inappropriate to add additional flows which would even

21 further adversely impact the wetlands and the

22 D. Blakely Hoar Sanctuary.

3

4

7

8

9

10

12

4

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

24

23 There are, as we mentioned in our comments, 24 numerous stormwater and environmental permitting it tonight and also in your letter, the storm drain

discharge from Gerry Road into the sanctuary. When we

Page 64

Page 65

3 took the site visit, there was a pipe in this buffer

zone that was in a swale. Is that part of the

discharge into the sanctuary? Are you familiar with

6 that pipe?

15

17

6

7 MS. BOWDITCH: I don't know. I'm sorry.

8 MR. HUSSEY: That's okay. I'm not surprised.

9 MR. GELLER: I thought it was on the west.

10 MR. HUSSEY: Over here?

11 MR. GELLER: Yes.

12 MR. HUSSEY: I'm pretty sure it was right in 13 here. That was my recollection, anyway. It was an 14 open pipe.

MR. GELLER: I think you're right.

16 MR. HUSSEY: Peter, do you have any idea?

MR. DITTO: I think it's a storm drain.

18 There's a spot in Beverly Road right about here.

19 Everything comes down from that point and then comes

20 across and into the site and somehow I think it winds

21 up in Hoar Sanctuary. But the pipe you saw that was

22 coming this direction, that's a storm drain.

23 UNIDENTIFIED: It was constructed within the 24 last 10 years to drain that area.

Page 63

requirements that will be applicable to this project, 2 and some that may also be applicable to the project,

3 and these are all referenced in our comments.

I would like, in particular, to draw your attention to the potential impact from phosphorus pollution which is a nutrient found in stormwater runoffs, especially roadways and parking lots. Phosphorus pollution is a major problem in the Charles River Watershed, and the Town of Brookline has a significant obligation to control and remove phosphorus pollution from stormwater.

This site will be required to comply with the total phosphorus daily load or the TMDO requirement. 14 It is a Federal and State requirement that would apply 15 to all large developments in the Charles River

16 Watershed. To our knowledge, there is not a plan

17 that's been presented to date as to how the development 18 will comply with this requirement.

19 I'd like to thank you very much for giving us 20 the opportunity to comment. I'm happy to answer any

21 questions that you may have. 22 MR. GELLER: Thank you.

23 Ouestions?

MR. HUSSEY: I just have one. You mentioned

1 MR. HUSSEY: Who's speaking?

2 MR. UNIDENTIFIED: Rubin (inaudible.)

3 MS. BOWDITCH: It sound like possibly what's

called an area drain, which is to drain landscaped

5 area, but I can't say. I haven't seen it myself.

MR. HUSSEY: Okay. Thank you.

7 MS. STEINFELD: I should note, of course, that

8 our peer reviewers will be able to respond to the

specific questions of that nature.

10 Next is Mark Zarrillo, Chairman of the

11 Planning Board.

12 MR. ZARRILLO: Chairman Geller, Members of the

13 Board, my name is Mark Zarrillo. I live on Copley

14 Street in Brookline, and I'm currently a chair of the

15 Planning Board.

16 The Planning Board would like to thank you for 17 this opportunity to comment on the comprehensive permit proposal by Chestnut Hill Realty for 192 additional

19 units at Hancock Village. The Board is hopeful that during the review process the applicant will make

provisions to the site in architectural design, and at

22 that time the Planning Board would like to submit

23 further comments.

The Planning Board does not support the

17 (Pages 62 to 65)

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

19

20

21

22

24

Page 66

proposal as submitted and in its opinion believes that it would be possible to have a better layout and design of the buildings and still receive the same number of units.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

22

Additionally, the natural topography of the site characterized by slow rolling hills, natural outcroppings, and a large green open space with many mature trees is not being respected.

The proposed plan causes significant changes to the property's topography. Many of these things you've heard tonight. The siting of the smaller 12 buildings makes it necessary to alter the natural grades by 6 feet and more, resulting in hundreds of yards of retaining walls. The parking lots require 15 extensive cut-and-fill operations to allow vehicle 16 movement and drainage. And the higher apartment building obliterates the signature stone outcroppings both in mini and major portions rendering it invisible and altering its natural contour while left exposed.

Additionally, the developer has located the building in the site's most environmentally sensitive areas. The townhouse-style buildings and garages have been placed on the green swath of land that was

originally intended and is still serving as a buffer

Page 68

Page 69

1 projects recommends preserving the natural features of the property, and this project has not achieved this in 3 any way. In fact, the proposed project will negatively 4 impact not only the renters who live on the property, but also the owners of the abutting single-family homes 6 by eliminating valuable green space and mature trees, 7 significantly changing the grades.

The Planning Board has supported many affordable housing projects in the town, including St. Aiden's redevelopment, Olmstead Hill, and the BHA project on Dummer Street but it cannot support this proposal as designed.

There is nothing keeping the applicant from altering the project to utilize existing space within the existing Hancock Village development. In particular, with respect to the apartment building, the Planning Board is not convinced by the applicant's assertion that revisiting all aspects of the project, in particular the siting of the buildings, would present insurmountable legal or technical issues.

Moreover, a revamped layout that emphasizes the use of space on the southwest side of the property could lead to a more financially viable project because the applicant would not have to utilize such extreme

Page 67

measures to blast out the underground parking

zone between the existing garden-style development and the abutting single-family homes. Not only will this beautiful green open space be eliminated, but the many large specimen trees in there will have to be cut down for the new buildings.

Similarly, the apartment building has not been appropriately located and will be on the puddingstone outcropping in the wooded area on the highest point of the property. The underground parking will necessitate blasting out much of the ledge including the apartment building which will be expensive and this money could be better spent elsewhere on the site.

Furthermore, the orientation of several of the townhouse-style buildings is awkward. As a specific 15 example, the ABD cluster at Asheville Road creates 16 shading over the A and B buildings by the D building, and the ground plane spaces do not relate well to these 18 buildings. The type B building adjacent to the Baker 19 School is turned sideways as if responding to a 20 street. In fact, it faces the service alley and 21 parking for the Baker School out front and its own parking to the rear.

23 The Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development Design Guidelines for 40B 2 structures for the apartment building. 3 If the applicant were willing, the Planning Board believes that the project would benefit both the 5 Town and developer -- a project benefiting both the

6 Town and the developer is achievable. The Planning 7 Board has worked with many developers on design

8 changes, and developers often state that the end product is better due to the collaborative process.

10 The Planning Board hopes that the applicant will 11 consider this and work with the Planning Board to rethink the building placement, land use, circulation,

13 open space, and amenities. Thank you. 14

MR. GELLER: Questions? MR. HUSSEY: Yes. I'd like to note, in your letter that you wrote to us you said you believe that it would be possible to have a much better layout and design of the building and still achieve the same number of units. And you also said there's nothing keeping the applicant from altering the project to utilize existing space within the existing Hancock Village development.

And I will not ask for you to go into detail, because I'm sure I would be told it would be an

18 (Pages 66 to 69)

15

17

18

19

21

22

2

9

10

11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

Page 70

inappropriate question, but I found those interesting and I was wondering if you were going to be part of 3 this meeting that's occurring on the 2nd of April with

4 the Planning staff and members of the Board.

MS. STEINFELD: There will be a designee on the Planning Board participating in those meetings.

MR. HUSSEY: Thank you.

8 MR. ZARRILLO: It might be me, but I have to 9 go back to the Board and discuss it with the Board.

MR. HUSSEY: Okay. Good.

11 MR. GELLER: Thank you.

5

6

7

10

17

1

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

23

24

12 MS. STEINFELD: Roger Blood, Chairman of the 13 Housing Advisory Board.

14 MR. BLOOD: Good evening. I'm Roger Blood, Chairman of the Advisory Board which also serves as the 15 16 trustee of the Town's affordable trust fund.

Unlike most of the other presentations you've 18 heard, I'm not going to speak about the physical

19 details of the proposed project itself. The main

20 reason I'm speaking for the Housing Advisory Board is,

first of all, because 40B isn't all about affordable 21

22 housing like it's supposed to be, and that the

23 developer, as a 40B applicant, has characterized the

24 Town's performance in the area of affordable housing as

so-called safe-harbor benchmarks for exempting cities

Page 72

Page 73

and towns from Chapter 40B's state-imposed permitting. 3 The first is that 10 percent of the total

4 housing stock be labeled affordable by the State, or

that a State-approved production plan that increases

6 affordable housing units by at least one-half of

7 1 percent of the Town's or the Municipality's total housing stock per year be approved by the State.

Any community that's not reached at least one of these two benchmarks may be deemed as deficient if not recalcitrant in terms of its affordable housing performance.

One would hope that the implementation of this law where a safe-harbor exemption does not apply, as is the case here in Brookline for Hancock Village, that some discretion rather than the arbitrary application of a formula might be exercised. In this regard, Brookline actually has a remarkable record of promoting, creating, and preserving affordable housing with over 8 percent of its 26,000-plus housing units designated as affordable and two more significant projects in the pipeline that will bring that figure closer to 9 percent.

Brookline is quite different than many cities

somehow subpar, so I think the Town needs to make clear

2 that that's not what the Town's performance is as a

3 basis for invoking 40B for this particular project.

I'd, first of all, like to concur with the remarks made by Chairman DeWitt about the affordable housing aspects of this proposal and in particular that unlike most of the town-initiated affordable housing projects, Chapter 40B uses some really strange arithmetic, the end result of which is that a great deal of physical development and new development and new construction is required to net a relatively small -- in this case, 20 percent of the total amount

of development in terms of true additions to the Town's

14 affordable housing supply. 15 The purpose of Chapter 40B promotes affordable housing in municipalities and the key needs for 16 17 promoting that goal is for the state to directly 18 authorize affordable housing construction in local 19 municipalities that are resistant to doing so on their 20 own. Despite enormous variations in the State's 351 21 cities and towns, this state imposes rather uniform 22 measures to determine an individual community's

Chapter 40B stipulates two uniform statewide

and towns around the state that have only 1, 2, or 3

2 percent affordable by both our actions and by the 3

numbers.

4 Brookline is also very different from most other Massachusetts towns in another respect. The land

within our borders is not only fully built out, but

7 it's already designed and developed to a density far

greater than most other locales, including a very large

stock of existing multifamily housing. In this regard, 10

Chapter 40B benchmarks impose on Brookline, along with

about 15 other built-out cities and towns around

Boston, unrealistic levels of annual affordable housing 13

production in order to achieve the safe-harbor status. 14 Now, one-half of 1 percent annual production

15 per year might seem reasonable and achievable, and it is so in 90 or 95 percent of all towns and cities in 17 the state that are not fully built out, but here in

18 Brookline, half of 1 percent of 26,000-plus units would 19 produce over 130 new affordable housing units every 20 year, year in and year out.

21 With or without Hancock Village, Brookline's 22 comprehensive plan and its consultants found no 23 plausible way that our town could produce, either

physically or financially, anywhere near the 100-plus

affordable performance.

affordable housing units per year. Achieving the

- 2 Town's comprehensive plan, even 25 new affordable
- 3 housing units yearly, requires a major financial
- 4 commitment by the Town and identification of scarce
- potential development sites, of which Hancock Village
- 6 certainly is one significant one.

7 We believe, and the Housing Advisory Board

- believes, that a significant number of affordable 8
- 9 housing units can be produced as part of a good infill
- 10 development at Hancock Village without running afoul of
- the other legitimate planning and design concerns 11
- 12 raised by the current proposal that you've been hearing
- 13 from the other speakers.

But such legitimate concerns do not include 14

- opposition to affordable housing, per se. In that 15
- 16 regard, HAB members -- no HAB members have encountered
- any community or neighborhood opposition to affordable 17
- 18 housing either at Hancock Village or anywhere else
- 19 throughout the town. So to the extent that Chapter 40B
- 20 was designed to overcome the opposition in many
- 21 Massachusetts communities to affordable housing,
- 22 including so-called exclusionary, Brookline is most
- 23 emphatically not one of those communities and never has
- 24 been. On the contrary, our inclusionary zoning for

Page 74 Page 76

- 1 atop Fisher Hill for the primary purpose of creating
- 2 affordable housing and where over 70 percent of the 34 3 units built there are permanently affordable.
- 4
- Finally, the Town's commitment of over
- 5 \$6 million of municipal funding at St. Aiden's where
- 6 over 60 percent of the 59 new units are permanently 7
 - affordable.
- 8 So as you can see, 60 percent, 70 percent is
- 9 quite a bit different than 20 percent at Hancock
 - Village.

10

22

2.4

11 State officials, including the HCD, have

- 12 recognized Brookline's commitment and its results
- 13 regarding affordable housing on a number of occasions.
- 14 My limited time in speaking to you tonight doesn't
- 15 permit a full description of these activities, but an
- 16 ample recitation of these things appears in the 17 August 29, 2013 letter from Selectman DeWitt to
- 18 Mr. Anthony Fracasso at MassDevelopment.
- 19 Thank you for allowing me to speak, and I'll 20 take any questions that you might have.
- 21 MR. GELLER: Thank you.
 - Ouestions?
- 23 (No response.)
 - Thank you.

Page 75

Page 77

- affordable housing is one of several ongoing
- initiatives that underpin the Town's commitment to
- 3 affordable housing.

6

10

- 2
- 4 Other key components of the Town's ongoing 5 commitment to affordable housing include first, a
 - municipal level of affordable housing trust which has
- 7 raised over \$11 million -- and that's a lot of funds in
- it for a town of around 50,000 -- for the production of 8
- 9 and preservation of affordable housing.
 - Also, the Town has a dedicated two-person
- affordable housing staff within the town funding as 11
- 12 part of its affordable housing division. We have a
- 13 proactive Public Housing Authority which manages over
- 14 900 low-income rental units and an additional 300
- 15 Federal Section 8 units. And the Housing Authority has
- also recently formed a nonprofit housing development 16
- 17 corporation that the Town is supporting with over
- 18 \$4 million of assistance funds to construct a new
- 19 32-unit development rental project in North Brookline.
- 20 Next, that the Town has a demonstrated
- 21 willingness -- and this is unusual, I think, across the
- 22 state -- to recycle valuable town-owned land for the
- 23 purpose of creating affordable housing. The Town
- recently provided five acres of very highly valued land

- 1 MS. STEINFELD: Alan Morse, Chairman of the 2 School Committee.
- 3 MR. MORSE: Good evening, Chairman Geller and
- Members of the Board. My name is Alan Morse, and I
- 5 have the privilege of being the current chair of the
- Brookline School Committee, and I thank you very much
- 7 for permitting me to speak tonight on behalf of my
- 8 colleagues.
- 9 While my comments may be a bit long, please 10 bear with me as I believe that all of the information
- is vitally important to you and to our community.
- 12 I'm speaking tonight on behalf of a very 13 concerned school committee about how the proposed
- Hancock Village 40B project could affect the long-term
- 15 capital expansion plan for the public schools of
- Brookline, a plan developed over the past several years
- 17 to accommodate extraordinary growth in our student
 - enrollments.
- 19 The School Committee voted for the long-term
- expansion plan in September of 2013 after receiving
- 21 recommendations from a nine-month community-wide 22
- discussion on the enrollment crisis and the space need 23 led by the Brookline School Population and Capacity
 - Exploration Committee, now, thankfully, commonly

20 (Pages 74 to 77)

7

14

15

16

19

22

Page 78

1 referred to as B-Space.

2

3

4

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

B-Space's work, in turn, built on planning that began in 2008 when enrollments had been rising for just two years. At that time, the Town and schools commissioned a facilities master plan along with a demographic analysis to help us formulate capital plans for the next 10 years.

That master plan, provided by MGT of America, predicted less growth than we subsequently experienced. In fact, our elementary population has grown since 2005 by over 1,300 students from 3,886 to 12 5,228, a 35 percent growth. We now recently anticipate approximately 874 additional incoming students in the next five years, even without the additional enrollment this 40B project would bring.

Even with their lower estimates in 2008, MGT advised us to move expeditiously to expand all of our elementary schools. Since then, we have successfully added space to accommodate a growth of 42 class sections in the elementary schools, some of which came from major renovation expansion projects at both Heath and local schools.

23 When our kindergarten enrollments continued to 24 grow, B-Space was formed to consider our options

including continuing to expand current schools, add a

constraints in Brookline's densely populated northern corridor. It is very difficult to subsequently expand

school buildings or find an adequate site for a new

The resulting long-term plan voted by the

School Committee focuses on the expansion of three of

our K-8 elementary schools as well as Brookline High

School. Specifically, the plans include expansion at

B-Space's final recommendations reflected the

new K-8 school, or reallocate students to different

schools with redistricting.

Page 80

and expansion project at the Devotion School. Those

overrides combined represent property tax increases

from existing homes which could amount to approximately

schools of Brookline's operating cost and the renovation

10.6 percent.

None of these plans incorporate the 40B project now contemplated in the Hancock Village. As you know, the project plans to create 192 new apartment units including 28 four-bedroom units, another 28 10 three-bedroom units, and 70 two-bedroom units with the remainder as one-bedrooms and studios. The family-sized units alone could add as many as 200 students to our schools.

What's important to point out, in addition, is that one-bedroom apartments and even some studios sometimes house families with children. One-bedrooms, for example, frequently have another room, either an alcove or a separate dining area, that, in the experience of the public schools, could be and have been used as a bedroom by a family eager for access to our school system.

The proposed development falls squarely within the Baker School's attendance district. A recent review of an expansion of our buffer attendance zones

Page 81

concluded that there was no rational way to include

Hancock Village in a two-school buffer, so Baker would

3 have to absorb all the elementary student growth from

this development.

5 Baker School now serves 754 students, approximately one-third who come from Hancock Village.

7 It is already in excess of its capacity when built of

student. Baker is now the second most crowded K-8

679 students. At 139 square feet of building space per 10 school in our system. 11 The B-Space report noted that both Baker and

Heath Schools have enough land to add classrooms should enrollment in South Brookline continue to increase. 14 The potential increases from the Hancock Village proposal, however, would require much more expansion

than the B-Space committee contemplated for either 16

17 school. Consequences could be so substantial that they

18 require a new school building entirely, perhaps

19 splitting the Baker population into two schools, uniquely eliminating our K-8 structure, which our

21 citizens have asked us to protect, or significantly

redistricting current students across the town,

23 destroying our beloved neighborhood school system.

Of equal concern is the potential impact of

13 the Devotion, Driscoll, and Lawrence Elementary 14 Schools, all three of which are centered in the area of 15 the most significant current overcrowding. And then 16 there's Brookline High School which would grow from 17 today's 1,800 students to a school of at least 2,500 18 given the children that are already enrolled in 19 Brookline. 20 In order to finance this ambitious expansion 21 plan, the school construction projects from now through 22 2022, the Town of Brookline is currently considering a possible tax override of \$12 million and a capital debt

exclusion override of \$5.6 million to fund the public

21 (Pages 78 to 81)

9

10

11

12

17

19

20

22

24

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 82

1 these additional students on the plans in place for Brookline High School. As mentioned earlier, we have

forecasted that by 2022 Brookline High School will have

4 expanded from its current 1,800 students to 2,500 5 students.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

more students.

As with the elementary school planning, we've been considering different solutions for the high school for some years. Last year we engaged HMFH architects to present us with some concepts for how the Brookline High School site could be expanded. Their analysis suggests that the Brookline High School campus could be rebuilt to handle 2,500 students but only with the loss of some gymnasium space and continued strain on common areas, neither optimal when we're serving

16 Others are concerned that the increased 17 traffic and parking required by the additional 700 high 18 school students and the resulting staff increases may 19 already be impossible to absorb at Brookline High 20 School's single location. Accommodating 2,500 students 21 will be a challenge, but should the Hancock Village 22 development go forward, our estimate of 2,500 will be 23 too low. That will fundamentally change the 24 conversation about how Brookline can or would respond.

Page 84

1 In short, the Chestnut Hill Realty proposal, 2 at a minimum, overburdens our schools and has the potential to fundamentally disrupt the same school

system that makes this development profitable. On

behalf of the Brookline School Committee and all the 6 students we serve, I urge you to consider this impact

7 before allowing this proposal to go forward.

In the alternative, I respectfully request that appropriate conditions be imposed to reduce the tremendous burden this proposal is likely to have on the public schools of Brookline. Thank you very much.

MR. GELLER: Thank you.

13 MS. STEINFELD: That concludes tonight's 14 testimony. On behalf of the Town's departments, 15 boards, and commissions, thank you very much for the 16 opportunity to comment on this proposal.

MR. GELLER: Thank you. I want to thank everyone who participated and who offered your words and your testimony. The Board will certainly take your comments and your recommendations into account in its deliberations.

Mr. Schwartz, do you want to speak at this 23 time?

MR. SCHWARTZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I

Page 83

Page 85

In particular, it will enforce reconsideration of the need for a second high school, an option B-Space did not endorse but one that may have to be back on the table for consideration along with other options previously deemed unattractive for Brookline.

Any of the options that would have to be considered for an even larger Brookline High School come with significant costs to the Town and the tax payers, potentially adding millions of dollars more to the taxpayer burden than even now is contemplated. Similarly, this would far outstrip any new revenues generated by the 40B project's residential properties.

More important, however, it will force 14 dramatic and unwelcomed changes in the configuration of 15 and local access to our public schools, changes that touch every family in the public schools, not just 16 those in the Baker School district.

17 18 Surging enrollments have stretched our 19 district's resources and demand a timely approach to 20 expansion that we have endeavored to meet with the 21 plans in place. The additional student enrollment 22 generated as a result of this 40B project will upend 23 our long-term expansion plan, rendering it inadequate at best and compromising financial planning.

wanted to thank all the members of the various 2 departments, the planning staff of the town that came 3 to express their views.

We're not, obviously, at this point going to attempt to address almost any of those issues in detail at this point, and we're looking forward to moving forward with the town officials as well as with the peer review folks who've been on the process -- who were retained to work through many of those technical issues with regards to traffic, drainage, public safety, design, et cetera. So we're confident that we can have productive discussions in that regard.

But I do -- and I am compelled to just make one central point that I think is very important which really goes to one of the central issues in this proposal which is the appropriateness of the location of the buildings and the overall site design.

There's a lot of talk about the buffer. In our view, that is an appropriate location for buildings. It is taxed for housing. It has been for many years. Parts of it have been developed. There is no legal protection whatsoever with respect to that space.

And so one can -- I'm quite certain that most

22 (Pages 82 to 85)

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

Page 86

of the people in this room are opposed to development in that area, and the Board heard many folks say that, but there is no protection of that area, and we think

4 it's an entirely appropriate area for development.

Even the now infamous 1946 agreement doesn't speak to the buffer zone, if you read it. We're quite confident that the 1946 agreement is no longer in effect, in any case, in relevance to these proceedings but if even you look at that agreement, it doesn't talk about protection of the buffer zone.

Similarly, we believe very strongly that the area where we've located the apartment building, the puddingstone, is an entirely appropriate area for that building. And certainly from a legal perspective, there's no restriction whatsoever in terms of putting a building there.

As a related point, and this is something that we are in the process -- we've explained to the Planning Board -- we're in the process of doing, as was mentioned earlier, in the sessions that are ongoing, one of the prime considerations to where these buildings have been located is the need, not just the desire, but the need not to create any nonconformities 24

with regards to the existing building that would entail

Page 88

Page 89

then, that what is fixed is the -- in your discussions with the Town, what is fixed is the location of the

3 buildings? When you talk about discussions with

4 design, you're talking about the aesthetics or --MR. SCHWARTZ: No. I mean there can be a

6 discussion of the location of the buildings within the 7 lot line that has been created. So we're not drawing a line in the sand with regards to location or orientation of particular buildings either with regards 9 10 to the two-and-a-half-story buildings on the outskirts 11 of the building, if you would like to call it a buffer, 12 or with regard to the apartment building itself.

So what we're saying is that the problem is going to be ideas of totally removing buildings from where they've been proposed and putting them on entirely other portions of the site.

MR. GELLER: Because of the issues specific to zoning?

MR. SCHWARTZ: Zoning issues. Potentially some NCD issues, but primarily zoning issues, either creation of new nonconformities, or the need to remove buildings in order to site buildings elsewhere on the site.

MR. GELLER: Okay. Thank you. We'll look

Page 87

forward to that memo on those issues.

Any other administrative details?

2 3 (No response.) 4 Thank you, everyone, again. We are continuing 5

this hearing until March 26th at 7:00 and at that time we will, based on our earlier discussion, be picking up issues pertaining to traffic and safety. We will have peer review and also discussions. Thank you.

(Proceedings suspended at 9:26 p.m.)

2 applicant is not in a position to pursue at this point 3 given some of the history here. We don't intend to go through any of that history again. We don't think it's 5 productive. But we are very cognizant of the fact that б we really cannot create any new zoning 7 nonconformities. That's where the process of showing

discretionary zoning relief that, frankly, the

the Town -- basically showing our work for how we got 8 9

here.

10

12

13

14

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

1

And so while we welcome, on the part of the Town, people working together with us in good faith to 11 work with us on the design, I think people on the board need to be very aware of those constraints and how we arrived at that at this particular site plan.

15 And with that, I'm happy to answer any questions but that concludes my rebuttals. 16

17 MR. GELLER: Mr. Schwartz, my understanding is 18 that there is -- you are in the process of reviewing

19 those nonconformities and you're going to produce 20 something?

21 MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes, we are.

22 MR. GELLER: Okay. Great. 23 Other questions?

24 MR. BOOK: I was just trying to -- I take it,

23 (Pages 86 to 89)

	Page 90	
1 2 3 4	I, Kristen C. Krakofsky, Court Reporter and Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, certify: That the foregoing proceedings were taken	
5 6	before me at the time and place herein set forth and that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of	
7	my shorthand notes so taken. Dated this 17th day of March, 2014.	
9	Kristen Krakofsky, Notary Public	
11 12	My commission expires November 3, 2017.	
13 14		
15 16		
17 18		
19 20		
21 22		
23 24		

		1	1
	Achieving	18:23	59:16
ABD	74:1	adequate	agencies
67:15	acres	7:16 29:10 79:7	11:12
ability	75:24	adequately	Agency
18:4 38:21	acting	7:2 36:23 42:21	11:9
able	10:10 47:8	adjacent	ago
23:9 24:11 25:10 65:8	actions	16:2 49:19 67:18	25:23 47:4
absolutely	36:13 73:2	administrative	agree
26:5,19	activities	89:2	15:18
absorb	38:9 55:8,20 76:15	Administrator	agreed
81:3 82:19	activity	44:24	5:16
abut	40:18	ADT	agreement
27:24	actual	32:3	12:18 34:24 86:5,7,9
abutters	47:1	adult	Aidan's
11:3 32:2	add	24:3	15:1,5
abutting	19:19 23:4 26:22	adverse	Aiden's
47:13 50:15 67:2 68:5	27:10 30:17 32:7	18:10 36:1,5,12 43:21	68:10 76:5
	42:5 50:22 62:20	adversely	Alan
accepted 58:12	79:1 80:12 81:12	18:7 62:21	3:2 77:1,4
access	added	advised	alarm
16:24 17:8 18:14	78:19	78:17	20:16,17
26:16 27:16 32:1,6	adding	Advisory	alcove
33:2,19 43:12 55:11	27:22 28:15 42:3,9	3:1 14:21 70:13,15,20	80:18
57:11 80:20 83:15	83:9	74:7	Alison
accessed	addition	aesthetics	2:13 5:3 13:14,15 43:7
53:9 54:17,20	29:21 30:14 44:1	60:3 88:4	alley
accessible	53:24 62:11 80:14	affect	67:20
34:16	additional	18:7 77:14	Allison
accessing	14:1 19:3,3 32:7,12,13	affordable	5:4 43:5
17:2	32:17 33:2 42:9,9	13:18,23 14:3,5,16,19	allocate
accident	46:3,12,18 49:7,16	14:24 15:1,6 45:13	13:20
31:15,18	62:10,20 65:18 75:14	45:15 46:1,3,8,12,15	allocated
accidents	78:13,14 82:1,17	46:21,22 47:1 49:7	14:13
31:4,16 32:21 33:4	83:21	49:16 50:22 56:17	allocation
accommodate	Additionally	68:9 70:16,21,24	14:14
9:9 53:18 77:17 78:19	66:5,20	71:5,7,14,15,18,23	allow
Accommodating	additions	72:4,6,11,19,21 73:2	66:15
82:20	71:13	73:12,19 74:1,2,8,15	allowing
account	address	74:17,21 75:1,3,5,6,9	76:19 84:7
29:6,20 84:20	8:24 9:1 17:11 31:3	75:11,12,23 76:2,3,7	alter
achievable	41:9 85:5	76:13	66:12
69:6 73:15	addressed	affording	altering
achieve	5:1 13:4 42:21	58:23	66:19 68:14 69:20
36:13,21 69:18 73:13	addressing	afoul	alternative
achieved	40:24 41:11	74:10	84:8
68:2	adds	age	ambitious
	l	l	l

79:20	4:4	approved	16:23,24 17:2 31:22
ambulance	apparatus	12:7 28:23 33:6,11	31:23 32:6,11 34:14
23:15 27:15,18	23:9,11,23 24:2,7,11	47:24 72:8	53:9 67:15
ambulances	24:12,19,22,23 25:4	approving	asked
27:14	25:11 26:3,23 27:17	49:13	60:23 81:21
amenities	Appeals	approximately	asking
69:13	1:5 11:7 13:1 49:16	31:12 78:13 80:4 81:6	9:24 39:12
amenity	51:2	April	aspects
56:11	Appearances	5:17,21 6:21 70:3	68:18 71:6
America	2:1	arbitrary	asphalt
78:8	appearing	72:16	61:1,7,9,12,16,22
amount	10:12	architect	assert
17:13 33:23 56:3,4		52:17	48:15
71:12 80:4	appears 43:18 76:16		
		architects 82:9	assertion 15:15 68:18
amounts 32:13	applicable		
	63:1,2	architectural	assertions
ample	applicant	8:4,5 50:5 65:21	10:14,21
76:16	10:14 12:16 15:15	architecture	assessed
analysis	21:22,24 45:2 48:11	9:3 50:9	50:1
5:15 60:7 78:6 82:11	49:3 50:17 51:2,5	area	assign
annual	58:13 65:20 68:13,24	16:10 22:20,24 23:7,8	51:2
14:14 37:7,12 73:12	69:3,10,20 70:23	24:15 27:23 28:10,16	assignment
73:14	87:2	28:19,24 37:21,22	20:16,17
answer	applicant's	41:17,19,21 42:14	assistance
35:3 63:20 87:15	4:18 10:17,21,23	46:5 54:16 55:23	75:18
Anthony	11:19 12:2 13:2 45:3	57:7 64:24 65:4,5	Assistant
76:18	68:17	67:8 70:24 79:14	2:15,19 15:9,12 40:10
anticipate	application	80:18 86:2,3,4,12,13	assisted
78:12	1:7 11:19 12:3 45:11	areas	60:18
anticipated	47:21,22,23 57:19,24	19:13 37:20 43:12	Associate
34:4	58:10 59:1 72:16	49:1 55:18 57:13,14	2:6,7
anybody	apply	59:4,14 61:12 66:22	associated
9:5 26:9 29:10 56:12	63:14 72:14	82:14	41:3,4,5 54:20 55:18
anymore	appreciate	area's	Associates
25:18,24	4:8	13:21	2:11 52:18
anyway	approach	argument	assumption
64:13	83:19	13:4	58:11,12 61:4
apartment	appropriate	arithmetic	atop
11:23 12:6 16:16 19:1	4:15 11:21 36:17	71:9	76:1
54:2,14 55:24 56:1,2	43:24 45:1 47:10,20	arrived	attempt
66:16 67:6,10 68:16	48:9 49:4 61:13 84:9	87:14	56:1 85:5
69:2 80:8 86:12	85:19 86:4,13	arterial	attempted
88:12	appropriately	31:6	56:12
apartments	13:8 67:7	articulated	attempts
42:3 80:15	appropriateness	50:11	53:11
apologize	85:16	Asheville	attendance
aporograe	00.10		uttenumee

80:23,24	83:17	81:23	blocking
attention	balance	belt	24:22 27:17
40:3 63:5	14:9	11:22 12:3 47:11 48:3	Blood
attenuation	based	49:22	3:1 70:12,14,14
37:1	12:23 31:8 32:2 52:1	benchmarks	Bluestein
attributed	53:2 89:6	72:1,10 73:10	2:9
44:11	basic	benefit	BMGs
August	53:24 54:21	69:4	37:5
76:17	basically	benefiting	board
Authority	40:16 87:8	69:5	1:5 2:2,21,24 3:1 4:20
46:17 52:13 75:13,15	basin	benefits	5:20,23 6:5,18,21 7:1
authorize	40:23	60:1	9:22 10:10 13:9
71:18	basins	berm	14:21 33:7,12 40:13
authorized	41:4,13,13	16:14	44:24 45:6,10 49:6
46:18	basis	best	49:15,15 51:1,2,6
automobile	71:3	28:22 29:6 37:4 52:22	57:2 58:23 65:11,13
53:4	bat	55:4,4 58:9 83:24	65:15,16,19,22,24
available	19:23	Betsy	68:8,17 69:4,7,10,11
4:7 5:21 12:24 34:2	Batchelor	2:21 45:5,9	70:4,6,9,9,13,15,20
46:14	2:22 51:12,14,15	better	74:7 77:4 84:19 86:2
average	56:21,24 57:5,22	42:6,7 53:18 66:2	86:19 87:12
19:4 32:3,14 37:11	58:2	67:12 69:9,17	boards
averaged	bear	Beverly	9:20 84:15
20:10	77:10	28:4 30:8 64:18	Board's
Avi	beautiful	beyond	45:7,11
2:7 9:24	67:3	52:21	Book
avoid	Beautifully	ВНА	2:4 9:7 10:1 87:24
5:14	44:16	68:10	borders
aware	bedroom	big	73:6
87:13	19:5 34:4 80:20	20:22 25:9	Boston
awkward	bedrooms	bigger	1:17 52:8 54:10 73:12
67:14	19:3	26:24	Bowditch
В	began	bit	2:23 58:18,20,21 64:7
$\frac{\mathbf{B}}{\mathbf{B}}$	78:3	59:19 76:9 77:9	65:3
67:16,18	beginning	Blakely	boxing
back	15:2	59:12 62:8,22	27:11
23:9,22,23 24:10,18	behalf	BLANCHARD	brief
25:6 26:3,19 39:20	5:11 45:10 77:7,12	6:10	5:12 60:21
54:5 55:17 56:22	84:5,14	blast	briefly
70:9 83:3	believe	69:1	10:13 35:17
backing	11:6 15:16 26:15	blasting 67:10	bright
24:3,7,24 25:11	39:23 57:10,12 69:16 74:7 77:10 86:11	blends	57:4,5
Baker	believes	57:16	bring 39:11 72:22 78:15
29:16 30:7 67:18,21	11:24 66:1 69:4 74:8	Block	Brookline
80:23 81:2,5,9,11,19	beloved	14:15	1:5,8,12 2:16,17 13:17
	Deloved	17.13	1.5,0,12 2.10,17 15.17

18:16,20 20:9 22:16	23:3 25:22 52:5 53:22	77:15 78:6 79:23	58:18 65:10,12 70:12
26:8 27:9 31:15	73:6,17 76:3 78:2	carefully	70:15 71:5 77:1,3
32:20 33:7,12 40:12	81:7	54:2 56:15	84:24
46:6,7,11,16,19	built-out	carries	challenge
51:16,19 52:8,18	46:13 73:11	11:4	40:21,23 41:12 82:21
56:16 59:23 63:9	bullet	cars	challenges
65:14 72:15,18,24	31:2,21 32:15 33:16	17:1 24:21 28:8,12,13	42:19
73:4,10,18 74:22	bumped	28:16,18 29:13 30:2	challenging
75:19 77:6,16,23	9:14	55:10	43:22
79:11,16,19,22 81:13	burden	case	change
82:2,3,10,11,19,24	12:12 56:12 83:10	1:6 11:15 12:10 38:17	82:23
83:5,7 84:5,11	84:10	71:12 72:15 86:8	changed
Brookline's	burning	cases	26:1
73:21 76:12 79:5 80:1	19:12	38:2	changes
brought	business	cash	7:13 33:5,11 48:14
22:23 23:17 25:14,14	7:21	14:8	54:22 66:9 69:8
buffer	bylaw	catch	83:14,15
16:1 19:10 47:11 48:3	13:19 14:2 35:12	40:23 41:4,13,13	changing
53:19,21 54:13 57:4	bylaws	cause	68:7
57:5 64:3 66:24	13:24 17:21	19:11	Chapter
80:24 81:2 85:18	B-Space	caused	11:10 12:15 71:8,15
86:6,10 88:11	78:1,24 81:11,16 83:2	36:16	71:24 72:2 73:10
buffers	B-Space's	causes	74:19
54:23	78:2 79:4	66:9	character
build		census	44:11 49:17
25:24	C	45:20	characteristics
building	C	center	44:21 48:8,17 52:3
8:6,7,19,21,23 9:2	1:21 90:1	54:13	characterized
12:6 16:16,19 17:5	calculation	centered	66:6 70:23
19:1,12,13 23:12,15	45:23	79:14	charged
24:18 48:1 55:24	call	central	18:19 21:6,11
56:1,2 66:17,21 67:6	88:11	85:14,15	charges
67:11,16,18 68:16	called	certain	51:19
69:2,12,18 81:8,18	24:13 65:4	4:14 11:13 61:7 85:24	Charles
86:12,14,16,24 88:11	calls	certainly	59:9,23 63:8,15
88:12	32:17	55:3 74:6 84:19 86:14	Chestnut
buildings	calming	certify	1:7 5:8,12 45:11 47:5
11:23 15:23 16:4,5,6	32:15	90:3	65:18 84:1
16:13 17:14 18:24,24	Cambridge	cetera	chief
19:8,14 32:19 47:15	34:22	85:11	2:16,17,20 17:8,9
50:8,10 54:14 56:7	campus	chair	18:13,16 26:8,8 27:9
57:13 66:3,12,22	82:11	51:16 58:21 60:15	27:10 30:21 40:11
67:5,14,16,18 68:19	capacity	65:14 77:5	children
79:7 85:17,20 86:22	34:19 38:20 77:23	Chairman	17:23 24:6,8 26:5
88:3,6,9,10,14,22,22	81:7	2:3,21,22,23,24 3:1,2	28:17 29:15 30:6
built	capital	10:9 45:6 51:13	79:18 80:16
		I	I

	I	I	İ
chosen	cognizant	9:20 84:15	compiled
48:13 49:4	87:5	commit	46:10
Chris	coherent	46:16	complaints
2:5 10:1	5:1	commitment	28:11,18
Church	cohesive	74:4 75:2,5 76:4,12	complete
15:1	44:4	committee	6:3 11:21 47:11 48:2
circle	Coincidentally	3:2 77:2,6,13,19,24	completed
22:9 25:10	47:21	79:10 81:16 84:5	28:23
circulated	collaborative	common	completely
4:15	48:23 52:7 69:9	82:14	53:22
circulation	colleagues	commonly	completes
17:6 44:18,19 50:14	77:8	77:24	35:2
53:12 55:20 69:12	colored	Commonwealth	complex
cities	57:7	51:23 90:2	15:4 44:13 49:19
34:22 71:21 72:1,24	combating	Commonwealth's	50:24 52:11,19
73:11,16	40:21	44:2	compliance
citizens	combined	communities	35:14
18:20 20:1 81:21	80:3	53:5 74:21,23	compliant
city	come	community	46:12
24:1 52:8,12	8:12 22:17 23:13 25:2	2:14 14:15 44:19	comply
class	26:17,17 29:2,3 61:5	46:14 48:22 49:12,18	14:11 61:22 63:12,18
78:19	81:6 83:8	53:20,23 54:6 55:7	complying
classified	comes	60:5 67:24 72:9	61:1
31:23 37:24 38:3,5	19:19 64:19,19	74:17 77:11	component
classrooms	comfortable	community's	51:11
81:12	42:15,22	71:22	components
clear	coming	community-wide	75:4
8:5,13 71:1	21:4 22:12 23:11	77:21	comprehensive
clearly	24:17 62:17 64:22	commuting	45:12 51:7 65:17
10:4 11:19	comment	34:21	73:22 74:2
clip	12:16 17:10 22:21	compact	compromising
20:24	25:13 39:14 60:14	44:5	83:24
clog	63:20 65:17 84:16	compactors	conceived
61:20	comments	42:5,6	48:16
clogged	6:8 9:6 41:10 59:6	companies	concepts
61:13	60:20 62:23 63:3	21:6 22:4 23:20,20	82:9
closed	65:23 77:9 84:20	company	conceptual
38:17	commission	20:19 21:11 52:9,15	47:6
closely	2:22,23 51:13,16,18	compare	concern
14:20	51:20 52:1 58:8,19	17:12	27:20 40:19,19 41:1
closer	58:22,24 59:2,17	compatible	41:16,22 42:10,20
72:23	60:8,13,16,18 61:6	15:7	50:1 59:7 60:6 62:9
cluster	62:9,19 90:11	compelled	62:10 81:24
67:15	commissioned	85:13	concerned
Cochrane	78:5	compelling	33:2 41:2,7 61:11
2:9	commissions	43:10	77:13 82:16
	I	I	I

1			
concerning	84:6	13:10 27:3 35:3 41:20	core
10:15	considerable	81:13	52:22
concerns	56:11	continued	corner
23:5 28:18 31:1 39:22	consideration	78:23 82:13	22:8
40:15,16 60:13,22	29:17 56:9 83:4	continues	corporation
74:11,14	considerations	12:4,5	1:15 75:17
concluded	86:21	continuing	correct
81:1	considered	79:1 89:4	48:12 90:6
concludes	49:20 53:16 83:7	contour	corrected
39:3 51:10 84:13	considering	66:19	58:11 62:18
87:16	79:22 82:7	contractor	correspondence
conclusion	considers	40:16 41:7	10:22
	49:13		corridor
13:6 18:9		contrary	
concur	consistent	74:24	31:17 79:6
71:4	47:7 50:19	contrast	cost
conditions	consists	12:9	80:1
42:22 43:21 49:14	20:17	contribute	costs
54:10 61:8 84:9	constraints	14:9 40:23 54:6	83:8
conduct	7:6 8:20 79:5 87:13	contributions	counsel
38:24	construct	14:3	1:10 2:12 10:11,17,23
confident	75:18	control	12:18 13:3 15:21
85:11 86:7	constructed	23:17 35:23 37:16,23	47:8
configuration	54:3 64:23	38:7,8 40:16 41:24	counsel's
83:14	construction	42:17 63:10	12:20,23
confirm	15:3 28:23 38:3,5,6,9	controlling	count
45:10	71:11,18 79:21	41:2	45:17
confirmed	construction-related	controls	Countdown
62:18	38:8	36:10	20:23
confirms	constructive	convenient	counted
41:7	51:5 56:18	30:12 34:2	46:3,7,23
connecting	consultant	convergence	country
31:10	5:20 6:3,18 7:23 17:11	52:12	19:17 24:1
connection	33:17	conversation	counts
38:23	consultants	82:24	31:8
conscious	73:22	conversations	couple
24:3	contains	4:22	54:9
Consequences	48:7	convinced	course
81:17	contaminant	49:6 68:17	17:16 65:7
conservation	36:22	cooperation	Court
2:23 49:24 51:17	contemplated	48:19	11:8 13:1 90:1
58:19,21,23 59:17	80:7 81:16 83:10	coordinated	Court's
60:8,16 61:6 62:9	contemporary	44:5	10:23 11:2,6 13:4
conserves	53:4	copied	coverage
44:5	continuable	4:14	48:6
consider	55:15	Copley	covering
19:18 69:11 78:24	continue	65:13	55:22
17.10 07.11 /0.44	Conunut	03.13	33.44

	1	1	1
create	Cushing	7:20	14:11
14:6,23 15:3 46:11	58:22	deficient	deputy
80:8 86:23 87:6	cut	72:10	20:18 23:19 24:12
created	67:4	defined	description
13:24 14:4,24 15:1	cuts	55:18	76:15
88:7	32:18 33:1	degree	design
creates	cut-and-fill	8:18 12:4	5:18,20 6:3,7 7:4,7,9
21:14 67:15	66:15	delay	7:22 8:4,19 9:2,3,9
creating	cyclist	4:4	9:14,16,16 15:8,10
5:14 72:19 75:23 76:1	33:8,13	deliberated	15:15,17,18,19 37:9
creation		4:21	39:6 43:17,18,23
88:21	D	deliberations	45:2,14 47:6,7,9,18
crisis	D	84:21	47:24 48:8,12,24
77:22	59:12 62:8,22 67:16	demand	51:4 54:2 59:8,16
critical	daily	33:15,19,24 35:7,8	60:19 61:21 65:21
9:10 27:14 28:20	32:3,14 63:13	83:19	66:2 67:24 69:7,18
37:20,21 59:22 62:1	damaged	demographic	74:11 85:11,17 87:12
cross	54:7	78:6	88:4
28:13 29:7 30:13	Dan	demonstrated	designated
31:12	27:8	52:23 75:20	72:21
crossing	dangerous	Dennis	designation
29:15 30:7,14	24:8 26:5	58:7	44:9
crossings	Daniel	denominator	designed
29:9	2:17	45:21	12:14 18:9 36:21 37:2
crosswalk	data	densely	37:11 38:14 44:16
29:3,4	31:14,15,18 32:2,20	79:5	50:8 68:12 73:7
crosswalks	date	density	74:20
28:21 29:8,17 30:15	9:12,13,15 11:3 63:17	54:19 73:7	designee
31:9,20	Dated	department	70:5
crowded	90:8	4:13 5:4 14:18 19:7	designers
81:9	day	22:3 25:17 27:13	52:16
cultural	28:9 31:7 32:4,9 34:20	32:21 40:20 41:23	desire
51:21	90:8	42:20,23 44:22 59:19	86:23
curb	dead	67:23	Despite
32:17,24	17:6	departments	71:20
current	deal	21:14 43:9 45:1 84:14	destroy
11:10,11 12:3,10	20:22 71:10	85:2	50:5
18:20 32:3 34:9 42:8	debt	Department's	destroying
45:16 47:12 48:15	79:23	40:15	81:23
52:22 74:12 77:5	decision	depending	detail
79:1,15 81:22 82:4	11:8 13:1,5	9:15	69:23 85:5
currently	dedicated	depends	detailed
8:18 12:14 14:1 19:10	9:14 75:10	43:16	11:14 48:9 60:14
28:21 29:23 31:6	deemed	deployment	detailing
32:5 33:20 59:15	58:14 72:10 83:5	22:3	50:10
61:21 65:14 79:22	deep	deposited	details
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

4:24,24 70:19 89:2	devoted	59:3	dominant
detection	8:10	discretion	44:20
38:23	Devotion	72:16	doors
determination	79:13 80:2	discretionary	55:11 57:11
12:9,10	DeWitt	87:1	double
determine	2:21 45:6,9,9 58:7,7	discuss	17:4 20:4 34:13
71:22	71:5 76:17	5:9,17 15:10 70:9	DPW
determined	difference	discussed	35:13 38:19
45:19 47:5 48:20	9:2	4:21	drafted
determining	different	discussing	8:18 47:4
11:13	17:24 22:7 57:3 72:24	9:13	drain
detracts	73:4 76:9 79:2 82:7	discussion	35:22 38:22 59:12
43:16	differentiate	4:16 5:2 6:6 7:4 77:22	62:12,13 64:1,17,22
develop	57:4	88:6 89:6	64:24 65:4,4
45:2	difficult	discussions	drainage
developed	30:10 79:6	51:6 85:12 88:1,3 89:8	6:8 7:9,18 9:17 18:8
15:7 38:10,12 50:2	dimension	disrupt	35:20 50:14 55:2
73:7 77:16 85:21	17:21	84:3	59:20 66:16 85:10
developer	diminish	distance	drain's
12:19 16:11 33:10	34:5	21:3 22:10,15	38:21
34:12,18,23 38:19	dining	distances	dramatic
39:5 66:20 69:5,6	80:18	20:13	83:14
70:23	direction	distinctive	draw
developers	13:9 17:22 44:23	44:11	63:4
13:20 14:23 69:7,8	64:22	distinguishing	drawing
developing	directly	8:18	88:7
13:18 52:15	10:21 59:12 60:6 62:8	distributed	drawn
development	71:17	50:21	5:13
2:14 14:1,6,15 16:1	director	district	Driscoll
17:12,15,16,17,18,19	2:14,15,18,19 13:14	51:18 80:23 83:17	79:13
18:18 20:12 21:9,9	13:16 15:9,12 17:9	district's	drive
21:18 22:7 23:1,1,7	30:23 40:10 43:8	83:19	24:17 25:2,8,19 26:18
26:4 28:14 29:22	directs	Ditto	28:1,2 29:13,24 30:9
30:2 32:7 33:4,18	14:8	2:18 30:19,22,23 39:4	30:16 31:5,10 32:18
34:15 36:15 43:11,15	disagree	39:9,14,17 40:7	32:22 33:6,8,9 39:1
44:3,5 47:19 48:16	15:16	60:23 64:17	53:6
49:7,14,21 50:4 52:5	Disaster	diversity	drivers
52:20 53:1,10 54:1	20:23	50:24	53:14
54:19 59:17 60:5,10	discharge	division	driveway
60:11 63:17 67:1,24	36:19 37:3,3,18 62:7	75:12	16:24 17:7 26:17
68:15 69:22 71:10,10	64:2,5	documents	due
71:13 74:5,10 75:16	discharges	40:15	11:21 16:10 47:10
75:19 80:22 81:4	35:19,22 37:20 38:16	doing	69:9
82:22 84:4 86:1,4	38:16,21 60:5 62:12	22:22 71:19 86:19	Dummer
developments	62:14	dollars	15:2,6 68:11
22:24 25:16 63:15	disciplines	83:9	dumpsters
22.2 : 23.10 03.13	arcipinics	03.7	adiipoteis

T			
42:4,4	egress	83:3	environmental
dwelling	32:18	ends	2:20 16:21 18:12
42:2,2	eight	17:6	40:11 43:13 48:1
dwellings	20:17,18,21	enforce	53:21,23 59:22 62:24
42:10	either	83:1	environmentally
dye	18:6 34:14 50:20	engage	36:2 37:9 66:21
38:22	73:23 74:18 80:17	51:5	environments
	81:16 88:9,20	engaged	41:4
$oldsymbol{\mathbf{E}}$	elementary	82:8	envisioning
eager	78:10,18,20 79:11,13	engine	42:13
80:20	81:3 82:6	20:19 21:2,16 22:8,11	equal
earlier	elements	23:16	46:22 50:23 81:24
4:17 12:9 21:20 45:18	8:6	engineer	erosion
47:8 52:24 55:22	eligibility	40:17 60:17	35:23 36:1,5 38:7,8
62:7 82:2 86:20 89:6	10:16 11:13 44:10	engineering	especially
early	47:5	2:18 17:9 30:23 59:3	27:24 34:20 63:7
52:14	eligible	59:18	Esquire
easement	44:9 48:21 51:23	engines	2:9,10 3:3
49:24	58:14	20:18	essentially
easier	eliminate	enormous	55:10 57:16
6:11	29:23 35:21,24 36:5	56:3 71:20	establish
easily	37:17 50:1	enrolled	36:9
34:16 49:24 56:8 57:8	eliminated	79:18	established
echo	37:8 67:3	enrollment	48:18 49:24
59:5	eliminates	77:22 78:14 81:13	estate
Edie	12:3	83:21	52:15 56:18
5:10	eliminating	enrollments	estimate
Edith	68:6 81:20	77:18 78:3,23 83:18	82:22
2:10,11	elimination	ensure	estimates
EEE	11:22 47:11 48:3	32:16 33:7,13 38:13	78:16
41:19,21	email	62:2	et
effect	10:18 12:20	entail	85:11
33:20 56:13 58:13,14	embodied	86:24	evaluate
86:8	53:1	enter	35:11 38:20
effective	emergency	15:2	evening
34:1	17:8 18:13,22 19:20	entering	4:3 7:19 10:9,12 18:15
effectiveness	23:18 27:18 43:12	29:13 30:2	27:8 30:22 40:9,17
34:5	emphasizes	entirely	43:10 58:20 59:6
effects	68:21	11:7 81:18 86:4,13	60:21 70:14 77:3
36:1,5	emphatically	88:16	everybody
efficient	74:23	entitled	4:7
44:4	encountered	13:7	evolved
effort	74:16	entry	42:5
48:23	endeavored	21:7 54:4 55:9	example
efforts	83:20	environment	19:4 52:14 67:15
51:3	endorse	36:11 41:15 44:8,14	80:17
		1	

	I	İ	I
examples	5:23 82:4,10	extremely	feasible
15:6	expansion	25:20 53:12	46:13
excavation	77:15,20 78:21 79:10		features
56:3,5,6	79:12,20 80:2,24	<u> </u>	68:1
exceed	81:15 83:20,23	faces	February
37:3	expect	67:20	10:19 12:21 13:3
exceeds	38:22	facilitated	federal
34:9	expects	5:11	14:14 46:5 50:19
exception	35:14 38:19	facilities	52:12 63:14 75:15
53:8	expeditiously	36:7 78:5	feedback
excess	78:17	facility	59:1
81:7	expensive	21:20 23:6 42:4	feeling
excitement	67:11	fact	60:4
24:5	experience	7:10 20:10 27:22 55:1	feels
exclusion	30:11 80:19	55:2 67:20 68:3	60:8 62:19
79:24	experienced	78:10 87:5	feet
exclusionary	78:10	factors	16:5,17,17,23 17:1,22
74:22	expires	47:24	18:1 31:12 66:13
excuse	90:11	failed	81:8
21:22	explain	11:15 12:12	field
exempting	17:20 57:2	fails	16:18,19
72:1	explained	15:11	fighting
exemption	5:13 86:18	failure	19:18
72:14	Exploration	11:17	figure
exercised	77:24	fairly	72:22
72:17	exposed	7:20 13:7	final
existing	66:19	faith	12:16 79:4
14:17 15:4 17:13,15	exposure	87:11	finally
17:16,18 25:21 26:11	19:12,15,18,21	fall	30:6 38:15,23 41:9
26:20,21 31:9,19	exposures	21:21 24:2	50:18 76:4
32:24 33:19 34:5	19:11	falls	finance
38:20,22 44:8,13	express	14:10 80:22	11:9 79:20
47:11 49:8 50:12,22	31:1 85:3	familiar	financial
54:10 56:4,6 60:11	extend	64:5	74:3 83:24
60:11 67:1 68:14,15	6:12	families	financially
69:21,21 73:9 80:4	extensive	28:15 52:10 80:16	68:23 73:24
86:24	66:15	family	find
exists	extensively	80:20 83:16	25:20 79:7
7:2	55:7	family-sized	finding
exit	extent	80:12	12:8
25:19 27:19	4:23 7:12 37:19 38:2	far	findings
exiting	43:15 74:19	73:7 83:11	11:13,14,18
29:14 30:2	extraordinary	fashion	fine
expand	77:17	4:13	39:20 41:9 61:19
14:16 78:17 79:1,6	extreme	Fax	fire
expanded	68:24	1:18	2:16 17:8 18:13,14,15

19:7,12,18 21:1,12	6:11 7:5 53:5 62:11	73:22	fundamental
21:14,16 23:4,9,12	flows	four	43:21
23:17,18 25:17 27:12	59:13 62:20	20:8,9,14,14 31:2,12	fundamentally
firefighter	focus	34:3,14	82:23 84:3
24:2	6:1,7 41:22 59:3	four-bedroom	funding
firefighters	focused	80:9	75:11 76:5
19:16	7:7	four-car	funds
fires	focuses	19:1	14:5,9,16 75:7,18
19:12,15 20:4	79:10	four-lane	further
firm	folks	31:5	5:24 17:10 48:9 62:21
41:10 42:11	85:8 86:2	four-story	65:23
firms	follow	19:1	Furthermore
52:16	9:16	Fracasso	44:8 67:13
first	following	76:18	future
7:4 10:8,22 11:2 19:17	18:10 36:13 43:5	frame	4:12 18:21 49:21
19:19 20:19 21:2,10	49:20 50:18 57:7	21:3	
22:10,12 23:7,11,16	football	frankly	G
30:24 31:3 35:11	16:18,18	87:1	garages
39:15 47:6 48:7	footprint	free	19:1 25:3 66:22
49:22 51:10 52:4	48:5	14:8 27:15	garden
57:1 70:21 71:4 72:3	force	frequency	48:22 52:4,12 54:1
75:5	83:13	33:23 34:20	garden-style
firsthand	forcible	frequently	16:1 17:14 67:1
22:22 24:1	21:6	80:17	geared
fiscal	Ford	front	20:3
14:10	2:16 18:13,15,15	23:14 54:4 55:11	Geller
Fisher	26:13,15,21 27:10	57:11 67:21	2:3 4:3 6:5,16,19,23
76:1	forecasted	full	7:24 8:14 9:5,11
fit	82:3	20:16,17 35:14 76:15	10:2,9 13:12 26:9
22:4	foregoing	Fuller	27:5 30:21 35:5
five	90:4,6	39:18	39:14 40:4 43:1,6
10:13 22:6 23:11	foremost	fully	45:8 51:9 56:20
75:24 78:14	19:17	38:4 73:6,17	63:22 64:9,11,15
fix	formed	function	65:12 69:14 70:11
62:19	14:22 75:16 78:24	38:13	76:21 77:3 84:12,17
fixed	formula	functional	87:17,22 88:17,24
88:1,2	72:17	43:12 53:2,20	general
flat	formulate	functionality	36:11 38:19 39:15
28:7	78:6	61:14	60:4,8 61:10,18
flaws	forth	functioned	generally
43:20 48:12	90:5	39:20	47:10,15,20 48:8
flood	forward	functions	generate
60:2	35:9 82:22 84:7 85:6,7	43:18 55:5	43:21
floor	89:1	fund	generated
1:11	found	14:3,4,7,9,17 70:16	14:2 83:12,22
flow	41:19,21 63:6 70:1	79:24	Gerry
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>

T			
29:2 64:2	3:3	82:13	5:4
getting	grade	02.13	health
22:10 24:22 30:15	16:14,23 25:9 56:4	<u> </u>	2:19,20 18:12 36:6,11
36:3	grades	HAB	40:8,10,11,14,19
give	66:13 68:7	74:16,16	41:1,2,15,23 42:20
6:2,13,15 7:1 46:24	Grant	habitat	42:23 43:13 60:4
	14:15	60:3	42.23 43.13 00.4 hear
given 7:6 8:21 79:18 87:3		half	
	granting	16:18 73:18	6:7,17 7:24 9:19 heard
giving	4:19	hall	
7:16 10:4 31:1 55:18	great	56:14	22:21,21 25:14 59:6
63:19	16:13 40:19 60:17	hammerhead	66:11 70:18 86:2
glad	71:9 87:22	17:7 25:15	hearing
6:17	greater		1:5 4:21 5:2 6:1 9:12
go	12:4 16:9 17:19 56:6	hammerhead-type	9:19 10:20 15:14
4:13 7:9,9 8:21 24:4	73:8	26:2	74:12 89:5
24:21 25:22 28:8	green	Hancock	hearings
35:17 54:9 56:5,22	11:22 12:3 16:3 17:13	15:14 22:15 27:24	7:8
69:23 70:9 82:22	19:9 22:13 26:16	31:11,20 32:5 33:1	heat
84:7 87:3	44:17 47:11 48:3	46:19 47:6,12 48:16	19:11
goal	49:22 53:19 54:13,13	48:18,20 49:9,11,17	Heath
45:22 46:15 71:17	54:23 56:23 57:3,4	50:6,15,22 51:21	78:21 81:12
goals	57:10,12 66:7,23	52:5,8,20 53:2,15,17	heavily
50:18	67:3 68:6	54:7 55:13 65:19	11:7 61:22
goes	ground	68:15 69:21 72:15	heavy
24:16 85:15	48:6 56:8 67:17	73:21 74:5,10,18	60:24
going	groundwater	76:9 77:14 80:7 81:2	height
7:20,21 8:10 9:18	36:17,23 37:8 60:2	81:6,14 82:21	56:5,6
19:13,14,19,21,23	Grove	hand	heightened
21:10 23:12,13,16,21	32:22	7:15 23:1 46:2	11:5
23:22 24:4,6,6,10,11	grow	handle	help
24:21,23 25:5,5,9	78:24 79:16	38:21 82:12	57:22 78:6
26:4,18 27:13 28:17	growing	handled	Hi
29:1,2,10,10,11,15	53:3	42:12	45:9
29:22,22,24 30:3,7	grown	happened	hierarchy
40:2 47:3 57:6 70:2	78:11	23:24	9:6
70:18 85:4 87:19	growth	happening	high
88:14	77:17 78:9,12,19 81:3	39:21	53:12 62:9 79:11,16
good	guard	happens	82:2,3,7,10,11,17,19
4:3 10:9 18:15 27:8,17	30:7,14	20:24	83:2,7
30:22 40:9 54:24	guess	happy	higher
55:22 58:20 60:4	57:6 58:2	63:20 87:15	37:14,15 66:16
70:10,14 74:9 77:3	guidelines	harmonious	highest
87:11	15:19,22 67:24	50:9	16:22 67:8
Google	Gustave	HCD	highlighted
20:23	52:17	76:11	11:18
Goulston	gymnasium	head	highly
Gomeon	gymnasium		ıngıny
	I	I	1

	I	I	
75:24	14:18,20,20 15:4,7	52:10	improve
Hill	44:13 45:13,15,16	III	14:17 51:4
1:7 5:8,12 14:24 15:5	46:6,17,23 49:8,16	1:1	inadequate
45:11 47:5 65:18	50:20 52:4,9,11,13	illicit	11:22 12:5 47:14 48:2
68:10 76:1 84:1	52:19 56:17 67:23	38:15,16,23	83:23
hills	68:9 70:13,20,22,24	illuminated	inappropriate
66:6	71:6,7,14,16,18 72:4	39:4	11:24 22:5 47:16
historic	72:6,8,11,19,20 73:9	image	62:20 70:1
44:6,10 48:21 50:5	73:12,19 74:1,3,7,9	48:5	inaudible
51:24 52:21,21 57:20	74:15,18,21 75:1,3,5	Imagine	65:2
59:19	75:6,9,11,12,13,15	16:17	incident
Historical	75:16,23 76:2,13	immediately	24:4
52:1 58:8	85:20	24:13	include
historically	hundreds	impact	5:23 12:24 32:11 39:1
14:13	66:13	27:23 33:17 42:14	74:14 75:5 79:12
history	Hussey	50:12,15 59:20 60:9	81:1
5:12 31:4 87:3,4	2:5 6:16,17,20 7:17	60:11 61:23 62:21	included
HMFH	8:2,22 9:4 10:1	63:5 68:4 81:24 84:6	46:2
82:8	56:21 57:1,18,23	impacts	includes
Hoar	58:6,17 63:24 64:8	18:3,4,10 36:12 38:8	18:21 32:21 34:24
59:12 62:8,22 64:21	64:10,12,16 65:1,6	41:8 43:22 48:1	45:23
home	69:15 70:7,10	56:15 61:2	including
14:15 16:8	hydrology	impede	5:18 29:15 33:20 38:8
homes	59:4	17:8	46:24 50:6 60:2
16:2,6 42:9 47:13 50:3		impervious	61:18 67:10 68:9
67:2 68:5 80:4	<u>I</u>	18:6	73:8 74:22 76:11
hope	idea	implementation	79:1 80:9
8:9 56:18 72:13	9:23 17:22 64:16	72:13	inclusionary
hopeful	ideals	implemented	13:19 74:24
65:19	52:12	37:17 38:10,13	income
hopes	ideas	imply	13:22 46:5
69:10	88:14	61:8	incomes
horses	identical	importance	13:21
25:18	48:7	53:3 59:7,11	incoming
hospital	identification	important	78:13
27:19	74:4	6:24 8:7 41:8 52:11	inconsistent
hour	identified	77:11 80:14 83:13	44:2
31:14	43:20 48:13 50:16	85:14	inconvenience
hours	51:21 62:15,16	impose	7:11,12
28:8 34:21	identifies	73:10	incorporate
house	14:19	imposed	80:6
24:14 80:16	identify	84:9	incorporated
households	51:20	imposes	49:8
13:21	ignored	71:21	increase
housing	54:7	impossible	14:19 19:23 32:10,14
3:1 13:19 14:3,16,17	II	16:11 43:22 82:19	33:22 34:3,4,7,12,18
	I	I	I

33:22 34:3,4,7,12,18	insect	45:5 51:12	John
34:19,20 54:19 81:13	42:18	inventory	52:8
increased	install	45:16 46:2,23	join
19:6 31:21 33:3 82:16	29:12	invest	45:1
increases	insurance	14:4	Jonathan
72:5 80:3 81:14 82:18	21:13 52:9,14	invisible	2:4 10:1
	insurmountable	66:18	Joslin
increasing 41:11	68:20		2:12 10:10
	intact	invoking	
Independence		71:3	jump
24:17 28:1,2,5,6 29:13	62:2,5	involve	55:21
29:24 30:9,15 31:4,5	integrate	8:22	jurisdiction
31:10 32:18,22 33:6	47:18	involved	4:20 59:5
33:8,9 39:1 53:6	integrated	8:16 48:24	Justement
54:11,20	44:15	involves	52:18
indicated	integrates	43:11	K
33:17 57:24	44:6	involving	Kate
indicates	integration	52:7	2:23 58:18,21
31:15,18	43:13 49:1	irreplaceable	Kathryn
individual	integrity	60:1	2:9
71:22	52:2	ISO	
inefficient	intend	21:13	keeping 68:13 69:20
44:1	10:19 87:3	ISO's	
infamous	intended	22:19	key 52:19 71:16 75:4
86:5	61:8 66:24	issue	
infill	intent	11:11 23:5 31:19	killed 24:2
74:9	4:22	41:24	Killorin
infiltration	intention	issued	
38:24	5:19 33:22	15:19	13:1
inflow	interesting	issues	kind
38:24	17:12 70:1	5:18 8:9,11,12 17:11	29:5,11 42:12
informal	interior	18:12 40:8 41:10,12	kindergarten
55:20	31:8	42:18 45:13 68:20	78:23
information	intermittent	85:5,10,15 88:17,19	know
12:23 59:19 77:10	62:13	88:20,20 89:1,7	7:13,20 11:4 26:22
ingress	internal	item	28:3 30:10 39:23
32:18	31:14 32:2 34:7 37:21	4:16 5:3	42:1 57:4 62:4 64:7
initial	interrelated	I&I	80:8
11:19	43:11	38:24	knowledge
initially	intersection	J	58:9 63:16
8:20	30:8		knowledgeable
initiatives	intersections	Jessie	58:3,5
75:2	29:12 31:17	2:3 10:2	Krakofsky
injunctive	Intrinsic	Jim	1:21 90:1,10
11:4	44:13	2:22 51:12,14	Kristen
injured	introduce	job	1:21 90:1,10
27:15	5:3 26:7 30:18 40:7	21:8 55:22	Krokidas
	I	I	I

2:9	42:17	listened	long-term
K-8	learned	27:9	38:11 77:14,19 79:9
79:2,11 81:9,20	26:23 27:1	listing	83:23
79.2,11 81.9,20	led	57:20 58:10	look
$\frac{}{}$	77:23	little	27:21 29:8,11,20
labeled	ledge	6:11 18:2 20:4 25:10	54:24 86:9 88:24
72:4	67:10	57:14	
ladder	left		looked 27:21 56:15
20:18,19 21:2,4,6 22:1	10:1 66:19	livability 44:19	
22:12,14,17 23:14,16		44:19 live	looking 85:6
ladders	legal		
21:17	68:20 85:22 86:14	65:13 68:4	looks
land	LegaLink	living	8:6
16:3 37:14,15,18 44:1	1:15	53:4 56:12	lose
44:6,17 46:14 50:1	legitimate	load	4:5 61:13
66:23 69:12 73:5	74:11,14	37:12 63:13	losing
75:22,24 81:12	lend	loaded	62:6,6
•	14:5	26:4	loss
landscaped	letter	loads	18:3 37:7 82:13
17:24 65:4	21:22 47:5,9 60:14	37:15,16	lost
lanes	64:1 69:16 76:17	local	4:6
31:12	level	31:23,24 50:19 53:10	lot
large	7:11 28:8 75:6	53:11 71:18 78:22	5:13,18 25:21 27:12
11:23 16:12 19:14	levels	83:15	28:8,10 29:15 39:18
22:24 42:1,2 63:15	38:1 73:12	locales	40:3 56:14 75:7
66:7 67:4 73:8	life	73:8	85:18 88:7
larger	18:19 19:6,17 52:9	locate	lots
16:6 27:1 55:19 83:7	53:20	34:14	63:7 66:14
largest	lifetime	located	loudly
52:4	39:23	15:24 66:20 67:7	10:4
laser	lightest	86:12,22	Louis
26:10	57:10	location	52:17
late	lights	21:20 24:12 25:1,15	low
13:3	24:5	28:21 34:8 54:14	31:24 32:1 82:23
law	limited	82:20 85:16,19 88:2	lower
13:8 58:15,15 72:14	4:23 20:3 39:23 50:7	88:6,8	12:6 78:16
Lawrence	53:8 76:14	locations	lowest
79:13	Lincoln	22:1 23:2 24:17 29:6	16:22
laws	1:16	30:11 33:21 49:4	low-income
59:15	line	53:17	15:3 75:14
lawsuit	22:13 32:23 39:2 56:3	logical	
10:15,24	88:7,8	54:21	M
layout	lines	long	M
66:2 68:21 69:17	5:13,18 20:13 30:1	16:17 17:7 21:12 28:7	2:10,11
lead	Liss	77:9	main
68:23	2:7 9:24 26:10,14,20	longer	20:7 70:19
leads	27:4 35:6,8	26:24 29:9,18 86:7	maintain
	1		

	I	I	
61:5,17	52:1 58:8	median	83:9
maintained	Massachusetts	13:22 46:5	mini
44:16	1:12,17 59:24 67:23	medium	66:18
maintenance	73:5 74:21 90:3	57:12	minimal
38:11,12 61:16,18,24	MassDEP	meet	59:15
62:4	35:12,15 36:18	5:17 6:13 12:12 15:11	minimize
major	MassDevelopment	15:21 37:5 38:1 39:5	36:14,15 50:11
20:15 53:6 60:6 63:8	11:15,24 12:7,11 47:4	83:20	minimized
66:18 74:3 78:21	76:18	meeting	37:8
Maloney	MassDevelopment's	5:5,11,16,21 6:21 70:3	minimum
2:19 40:7,9,10 43:4	11:17	meetings	17:21 33:4,9 36:9 84:2
managed	MassHighway	5:6 70:6	minor
42:4	11:9	member	23:19
management	massing	2:6,7 4:5 51:17 58:7,8	minute
33:15,19 34:1 35:7,8	11:23 47:14 48:1 56:2	members	16:18 20:12
35:13,15 36:8,18,20	massive	2:2 6:5 9:22 10:10	minutes
37:1,5,10 38:17	12:6	65:12 70:4 74:16,16	10:13 20:9,10,14,17
42:11 59:8	master	77:4 85:1	20:20,21,22,24 21:5
manager	78:5,8	memo	21:10
52:17	material	89:1	misunderstanding
managers	13:2 61:4	memorandum	12:22
62:4	materials	40:14	mitigate
manages	4:10	men	16:12 43:23 50:11
75:13	math	18:21 19:22 20:8,14	mitigated
Manchester	45:15 46:22 47:2	24:7 25:4 26:3 32:12	12:1 47:16 50:17
51:15	matter	mention	mitigation
manner	4:19,19 11:2,8 13:1	25:13 40:17 45:12	33:5,10
15:7 30:5	mature	60:3,22 62:11	mobile
manpower	16:3 18:3 49:23 55:1	mentioned	50:21
19:22	66:8 68:6	45:18 47:8 54:17	moderate-density
map	maximum	59:23 62:7,23 63:24	53:5
20:12 22:6 57:6	37:19 38:2	82:2 86:20	modern
March	MBTA	Merrill	34:24
1:9 5:9 6:1,13 9:12,13	33:21	1:15	money
89:5 90:8	mean	met	67:11
Marcus	88:5	5:8 38:4 39:7	monitoring
60:16	meaningful	MGT	33:16 62:1
Marion	48:14	78:8,16	monitors
11:8	means	midblock	41:18,18
Mark	17:23 21:18 35:18	31:19	Morse
2:6,24 10:1 65:10,13	meant	miles	3:2 77:1,3,4
market-rate	15:24	20:20 21:4,17 31:13	mosquito
45:24 46:20 47:1	measure	million	41:17,21
market-rates	37:23	14:2,7,10 75:7,18 76:5	mosquitos
46:9	measures	79:23,24	40:21,24,24 41:5
Mass	32:15 69:1 71:22	millions	motion
	l	l	

11:3	58:7	5:14 14:6,23 16:4,12	90:11
motor	near	18:18,23 19:5 27:22	nuisance
32:21 33:3	73:24	29:3 33:18,18 38:3,5	42:22
move	nearby	46:24 49:5,6 50:4,8	number
7:7 9:18 47:3 78:17	36:6 50:16 56:12	53:10,13 54:14 60:5	1:6 4:9 9:21 10:14
movement	necessarily	60:10 67:5 71:10,11	12:17 19:11 21:24
66:16	30:13	73:19 74:2 75:18	32:15 34:8,13 36:19
moving	necessary	76:6 79:2,7 80:8	37:7,14 38:6 42:1,2
35:9 36:18 85:6	4:8 66:12	81:18 83:11 87:6	45:19 66:3 69:19
multifamily	necessitate	88:21	74:8 76:13
73:9	67:9	NFPA	numbers
multistory	necessity	20:2	73:3
50:10	30:16	NFPA's	numerous
municipal	need	20:23	60:9 62:24
14:5,9 35:20 36:2,7	7:1 9:9 23:3,4 40:2	nice	nutrient
51:3 59:14 75:6 76:5	41:14 56:15 77:22	19:10 55:9,12	63:6
		19:10 33:9,12 nine-month	nutshell
municipalities	83:2 86:22,23 87:13 88:21	77:21	18:23
21:15 71:16,19			18:23
Municipality's	needed	noncompliance	0
72:7	6:13 9:8	39:12	objective
Murphy	needs	nonconformities	8:11
2:9,12 10:9,10 13:13	6:12 19:20 22:4 47:17	86:23 87:7,19 88:21	
47:8	50:19 71:1,16	nonconformity	obligation 12:12 63:10
Mutual	negative	5:14	
52:8	50:13	nonpoint	obliterates
mysteriously	negatively	36:15	66:17
47:23	68:3	nonprofit	observed
N	neighborhood	75:16	39:19
	19:6 43:14 47:13	nonstormwater	obvious
name	50:12 51:17 54:18	35:21	7:11 35:18
10:2,4 30:22 40:9	74:17 81:23	North	obviously
51:14 65:13 77:4	neighborhoods	75:19	54:10,12 56:16 62:1
narrow	42:14 49:10	northern	85:4
16:24	neighboring	79:5	occasions
National	50:9	Notary	28:2 76:13
44:9 48:21 51:23	neither	90:2,10	occupied
52:16 57:20 58:16	82:14	note	46:7
natural	net	13:2 54:12 60:15 61:6	occurred
36:11 44:15 49:1,18	71:11	65:7 69:15	31:16
50:5 66:5,6,12,19	Netter	noted	occurring
68:1	2:10,11 5:11	19:9 40:18 81:11	32:24 70:3
nature	network	notes	offered
65:9	43:11,16	90:7	10:20 84:18
NCD	never	Notice	offers
88:20	74:23	54:16	19:10
NCDC	new	November	office

1:10 13:10 14:17,18 61:24 75:12 87:10 outstrip 21:13 operations 83:11 participate officially 66:15 overall 5:21 44:9 opinion 51:4 62:11 85:17 participated officials 6:15 12:17,23 66:1 overburdens 84:18 51:3 76:11 85:7 opportunities 84:2 participating 14:16,19 60:9 62:3 overcome 70:6 okay 9:4,17,18 36:4 39:13 opportunity 74:20 particles 7:2.16 31:1 48:12 57:18 64:8 65:6 overcrowding 61:20 70:10 87:22 88:24 58:24 63:20 65:17 79:15 particular 45:13 59:3.11 60:23 override old 84:16 79:23.24 36:3 oppose 63:4 68:16,19 71:3,6 olive 51:6 overrides 83:1 87:14 88:9 57:7 80:3 particularly opposed **Olmstead** 61:9 86:1 owners 61:2,15 14:24 15:5 52:18 opposite 68:5 parties 68:10 29:1,1 4:15 48:23 owning 52:15 partnerships ones opposition 41:3 74:15,17,20 O&M 14:22 one-and-a-half-mile optimal 40:1 Parts 21:15 22:9 82:14 85:21 O'Leary one-bedroom 2:17 26:8 27:8,8 35:7 option passive 80:15 83:2 35:9 55:19 57:13,17 one-bedrooms options Pat P 80:11,16 22:1 78:24 83:4,6 2:19 10:7 40:7,9 packages one-half order patience 4:10 72:6 73:14 6:2,6,14,24 7:1 10:7 4:8 **Pages** 33:17,24 46:12 61:17 one-story patient 73:13 79:20 88:22 1:2 12:6 10:5 paramount one-third orientation patio 44:17 81:6 67:13 88:9 57:16 park ongoing original pattern 55:10 57:20 10:15,24 62:1 75:1,4 12:19 23:1 47:21.24 47:19 53:16 55:13,14 parked 86:20 48:24 54:1 patterns 24:21 32:8 originally 17:13 49:8 53:3 on-site parking 32:9 33:22 34:10,13 66:24 Paul 19:2 28:3 29:21,23 outcropping 2:16 18:15 open 32:5.8 39:18 53:8 17:18,21,24 18:2 49:1 16:21 67:8 paved 54:3 63:7 66:14 67:9 49:18,23 53:24 54:5 outcroppings 53:22 67:21.22 69:1 82:17 55:5,12,17,19 57:9 50:7 57:8 66:7,17 pavement **Parkway** 57:17 61:18 64:14 outlining 39:15,16,17,22 40:2 28:7 66:7 67:3 69:13 40:14 62:5 part operating outskirts payers 15:24 17:16 27:20 80:1 88:10 83:9 39:24 42:19 52:6 operation outstanding peak 54:11 64:4 70:2 74:9 23:15 38:11,12 61:15 52:2 34:21 37:2 38:21

pedestrian	person	36:14 37:5 62:19	52:19
31:19 32:16 33:8,13	30:9	82:1 83:21 90:5	plays
44:17 49:3	personnel	placed	53:19
pedestrians	20:3 62:4	66:23	please
31:10,11 53:14	persons	placement	77:9
Peek	19:4	17:5 69:12	pleased
37:1	perspective	places	5:7 44:24 45:5
peer	86:14	28:22 44:10 48:21	plus
5:20 6:14,18 7:16,18	pertaining	51:24	46:21
8:9,24 9:8,15 65:8	10:15 12:18 89:7	plan	point
85:8 89:8	pertains	8:19,21,22 38:7,11,12	6:24 8:2 16:22 21:19
peninsular	11:3	43:15 44:12,20 49:2	28:24 30:17 55:23
31:6	pervious	54:8,22 56:22 61:24	64:19 67:8 80:14
people	18:6	63:16 66:9 72:5	85:4,6,14 86:17 87:2
28:12,16 29:15,18	Peter	73:22 74:2 77:15,16	pointed
30:3,12,15 55:10,19	2:18 30:19,22 64:16	77:20 78:5,8 79:9,21	8:8
57:15 86:1 87:11,12	philosophy	83:23 87:14	points
percent	48:18	plane	6:7 10:24 31:2 33:3
13:20,21 16:9 18:5	phosphorus	67:17	police
32:14,23 34:9,10	63:5,8,10,13	planned	2:17 17:9 26:8 27:9,13
37:11 45:22,22 46:4	photograph	48:22	31:15 32:20
46:9 50:23 71:12	54:23	planners	policy
72:3,7,20,23 73:2,14	photographs	15:18	14:8,12 34:7
73:16,18 76:2,6,8,8,9	55:12 57:14	planning	pollutants
78:12 80:5	physical	2:14,15,24 4:13 5:4	62:14,17
percentage	70:18 71:10	8:4,9,10 13:13,16	pollution
53:12	physically	14:18 15:8,10,13	36:15 37:15,16,16
percentile	73:24	43:8 44:22 52:7,12	38:6 63:6,8,11
31:13	pick	52:19,20 65:11,15,16	Polly
perfect	30:12	65:22,24 68:8,17	2:15 15:9,12 55:21
42:6	picking	69:3,6,10,11 70:4,6	poor
performance	89:6	74:11 78:2 82:6	17:6
70:24 71:2,23 72:12	pickups	83:24 85:2 86:19	poorly
performed	42:7,12	plans	18:9 48:16
61:16	piece	41:8 42:11 44:16 59:2	populated
period	56:18	78:6 79:12 80:6,8	79:5
38:6	pilot	82:1 83:21	population
permanently	39:19	plant	42:1,8 77:23 78:10
76:3,6	pipe	16:12	81:19
permission	64:3,6,14,21	plan's	pore
51:12	pipeline	43:17	61:17
permit	45:18 72:22	plausible	porosity
45:12 51:7 65:17	pipes	73:23	61:5,17 62:2,5
76:15	55:2,6	play	porous
permitting	place	17:23	39:15,16,17,22 40:2
62:24 72:2 77:7	23:8 29:24 30:12,13	played	61:1,7,9,12,16,22
		l	I

62:5 present private prohibited 4:14 23:7 presentation 14:6,23 57:16 38:17 portions 10:3 12:20 27:20 35:2 prohibition 66:18 88:16 39:3 51:11 proactive project position 75:13 5:13 10:16 11:13,20 22:20 45:11 48:11 9:21 48:10 70:17 probably 12:7,13 13:7 14:24
portion 68:20 82:9 14:6,23 57:16 38:17 14:14 23:7 presentation privilege prohibition portions 10:3 12:20 27:20 35:2 77:5 38:15 66:18 88:16 39:3 51:11 proactive project position 75:13 5:13 10:16 11:13,20
14:14 23:7 presentation privilege prohibition portions 10:3 12:20 27:20 35:2 77:5 38:15 66:18 88:16 39:3 51:11 proactive project position presentations 75:13 5:13 10:16 11:13,20
portions 10:3 12:20 27:20 35:2 77:5 38:15 66:18 88:16 39:3 51:11 proactive project position presentations 75:13 5:13 10:16 11:13,20
66:18 88:16 39:3 51:11 proactive project position 75:13 5:13 10:16 11:13,20
position presentations 75:13 5:13 10:16 11:13,20
22:20 45:11 48:11 9:21 48:10 /0:1/ probably 12:7,15 15:7 14:24
0.72 20.0 57.7 14 15.1 2.5 20 17.14
87:2 presented 9:23 30:9 57:7,14 15:1,2,5,20 17:14
possible 63:17 problem 18:4,23 32:17 38:3
7:18,22 37:19 38:2 presents 19:7,20,21 23:4 24:23 39:16 40:1 41:6
46:17 66:2 69:17 19:6 26:20,21 42:5 63:8 43:14,24 46:16 47
79:23 preservation 88:13 51:4 52:7,17 61:1.
possibly 2:22 51:13,16,20 75:9 problems 61:12,21 63:1,2 63
65:3 preserve 19:15,24 25:11 42:18 68:3,11,14,18,23
postconstruction 56:10 42:18,23 62:16 69:4,5,20 70:19 7
36:8 37:12 preserving proceed 75:19 77:14 78:15
postdevelopment 13:18 49:10,17 68:1 5:10 56:19 80:2,7,8 83:22
37:2 proceeding projected
posture pretty 12:14 34:11,11
10:24 proceedings projects
potential prevention 4:1,7 86:8 89:9 90:4 14:5 15:4,6,19 37:2
7:10 30:6 31:5 32:9 37:17 38:7 process 68:1,9 71:8 72:22
37:14,15 50:13 63:5 previous 7:8 65:20 69:9 85:8 78:21 79:21
74:5 81:14,24 84:3 41:20 86:18,19 87:7,18 project's
potentially previously produce 11:21 47:10,13,14
27:22 61:20 83:9 40:13,18 42:3 83:5 73:19,23 87:19 60:19 83:12
88:19 primarily produced prominent
practical 8:10 32:1 44:11 88:20 74:9 52:16
7:15 primary product promise
practices 9:19 21:8 53:11 54:12 69:9 10:13
37:5 52:13,21,23 55:4 76:1 production promote
55:4 prime 72:5 73:13,14 75:8 27:3 44:4 50:24
preceded 86:21 productive promotes
11:9 principals 5:10,16 85:12 87:5 71:15
precedence 15:11 professional promoting
44:18 principle 60:17 13:18 71:17 72:19
precept 55:10 professionals proof
54:22 principles 15:18 11:5
predevelopment 15:8,17 44:3,4 52:13 profitable properties
37:3 52:22 53:1,4 54:1 84:4 49:20 50:16 83:12
predicted prior program property
78:9 4:22 12:17 35:1 39:19 18:20 32:2 49:4 62:
preliminary priorities programs 67:9 68:2,4,22 80:
5:5 13:5 39:10 47:4
preparing priority progress 66:10
60:20 8:20 45:13 proposal
Size

20.6.42.11.46.20	25,20,54,2	9.12 0.22 10.5 26.0	25.6.41.12.46.15
39:6 43:11 46:20	35:20 54:2	8:13 9:23 10:5 26:9	35:6 41:12 46:15
47:6 48:6 53:10,21	providing	30:18 35:3,5 40:4	52:15 56:18
65:18 66:1 68:12	16:7 43:10	42:24 43:1 63:21,23	reallocate
71:6 74:12 81:15	provisions	65:9 69:14 76:20,22	79:2
84:1,7,10,16 85:16	65:21	87:16,23	really
propose	public	quick	8:6 25:21 46:1 71:8
12:4,5	2:19 4:21 6:1,2 36:6	27:19 35:6	85:15 87:6
proposed	37:22 40:10 41:1,2	Quigley	realty
15:10 16:19 17:14,17	41:15,23 43:12,13	60:16	1:7 5:8,12 7:16 65:18
17:19 21:9 23:7 29:3	50:14 60:3 75:13	quite	84:1
30:15 32:7,17 43:23	77:15 79:24 80:19	22:15 59:19 72:24	Realty's
47:15,17 48:15 49:5	83:15,16 84:11 85:10	76:9 85:24 86:6	45:11 47:6
49:13 53:13 54:8,15	90:2,10	quotations	rear
60:24 61:11 66:9	public/health	8:17	67:22
68:3 70:19 77:13	36:2	quote	reason
80:22 88:15	puddingstone	48:8	54:18 55:14 70:20
proposing	16:21 50:7 56:7,10		reasonable
9:11 16:15	67:7 86:13	R	73:15
protect	purpose	Radiant	reasoning
36:10 49:17 50:4	9:19 35:21,24 36:4,9	19:11	11:14
51:20 81:21	36:13 71:15 75:23	radius	rebuilt
protected	76:1	21:16 22:14,18 24:20	82:12
49:23 59:14 60:1	purposes	25:20	rebuttal
protecting	4:12	raise	21:23
19:24 49:18		8:3	rebuttals
	pursue	raised	87:16
protection	7:4 13:10 87:2	74:12 75:7	
18:19 19:19,22 22:20	put	ran	recalcitrant
23:5 37:22 59:4 60:2	36:14 43:23 55:2	24:3	72:11
85:22 86:3,10	putting		receive
protects	86:15 88:15	range 43:9	66:3
36:23 44:6	P.C		received
protocol	2:11	ranges	4:9,17 14:7
26:11	p.m	16:17	receives
prototype	1:9 4:2 89:9	rate	59:15
49:11		34:10 37:1 38:21	receiving
proved	Q	rates	77:20
42:5	qualities	37:3,4	recharge
proven	49:10 50:6 54:6	rational	36:17 37:7,7 60:3
13:17	quality	81:1	recitation
provide	37:10 54:6 56:10 60:2	reached	76:16
11:14 33:5,10 36:16	quantifiable	12:18 72:9	recognized
49:16 52:9 55:5	8:12	read	76:12
58:24	question	86:6	recognizing
provided	4:16 9:24 22:7 56:22	ready	53:3
5:12 32:20 75:24 78:8	57:19 70:1	51:1	recollection
provides	questions	real	64:13
1			

	Ī	İ]
recommend	Register	remove	63:13,14,18
20:22 21:1,15 49:20	44:10 48:21 51:24,24	37:11 61:19 63:10	requirements
recommendations	Registry	88:21	36:10 47:7 61:23 63:1
77:21 79:4 84:20	58:16	removed	requires
recommends	regulations	56:13	13:19 23:23 37:22
5:22,24 68:1	11:10,12 12:13 35:10	removing	60:7 74:3
reconciling	regulatory	88:14	rescue
45:4	2:15 15:9,13 58:15	rendering	21:7,8,11
reconsideration	rehabilitate	66:18 83:23	residences
83:1	15:4	renovation	1:8 22:15 47:12
record	reintroduce	78:21 80:1	resident
4:11 13:17 72:18	9:22	rental	51:15 58:22
recycle	relate	75:14,19	residential
75:22	8:12 67:17	renters	16:4 49:7,12 83:12
redevelopment	related	68:4	residents
37:24 38:1 68:10	86:17	repeat	17:23 19:5 21:8 27:22
redistricting	relationship	10:19	28:15 29:6 32:19
79:3 81:22	54:3	replace	33:18 34:2,12,18
reduce	relatively	55:6	44:15 46:4,7 50:15
33:17 35:24 36:5	71:11	replaced	62:3
37:17 56:1 60:9,10	releases	16:4	resistant
61:23 84:9	23:20 24:13	report	71:19
reducing	relevance	5:7 6:4 81:11	resource
61:2	86:8	reported	51:22 59:4,14 60:17
referenced	reliance	23:12 32:21	resources
63:3	60:24	Reporter	36:11 43:13 44:6,15
referred	relied	1:21 90:1	48:2 49:2,19 51:3,21
10:16,23 12:17 78:1	11:7	reports	59:21,22,24 60:12
refers	relief	7:19 57:24	83:19
36:20	11:4 87:1	represent	respect
refinement	relies	56:11 80:3	4:18 31:2 34:9 44:14
8:15	61:21	representative	68:16 73:5 85:22
reflected	remain	5:23	respected
79:4	61:17	representatives	66:8
refuse	remainder	21:21	respectfully
51:5	80:11	represents	12:11 13:6 84:8
regard	remained	52:11 55:24 57:10,12	respects
11:1 13:11 61:3 72:17	48:3	request	45:2
73:9 74:16 85:12	remarkable	4:9,18 8:17 84:8	respond
88:12	72:18	require	10:13,21 65:8 82:24
regarding	remarks	11:12 66:14 81:15,18	responding
76:13	60:21 61:8 71:5	required	67:19
regards	remember	16:9 32:16 33:5,10,15	response
85:10 86:24 88:8,9	7:3	34:13,18 50:21 61:18	11:18 12:2 18:17 20:2
region	removal	63:12 71:11 82:17	21:16 26:12 27:6
52:5	36:22	requirement	40:5 43:2 76:23 89:3

responses	6:22 8:2 19:22 22:8	41:24 42:11,17	says
27:12	23:14 25:22 26:16	Rubin	20:15
rest	29:4 64:12,15,18	65:2	scale
4:6	rigorous	ruling	16:16 41:7 50:10
restriction	61:15	11:2,6	scarce
86:15	Ring	run	74:4
result	52:17	24:4	scene
13:10 33:3 43:21	rising	running	18:22 20:6,8,14,16
47:17 71:9 83:22	78:3	74:10	21:1,11 24:14 25:7
resulting	risk	runoff	scenes
66:13 79:9 82:18	18:18	36:14,16 37:18 59:13	19:20
results	River	59:15 61:3	school
76:12			
	24:2 59:9,23 63:9,15	runoffs	3:2 29:16 30:7,16
retained	road	63:7	67:19,21 77:2,6,13
49:22 85:9	16:23 17:1,3,3 25:2	runs 20:11	77:19,23 79:2,7,10
retaining	28:4,24 29:2,3 32:3		79:12,16,17,21 80:2
66:14	32:11 33:11 34:14,15	Russett	80:21 81:5,10,17,18
retention	51:15 53:10,11 54:12	17:3,3 31:22,23 32:3,6	81:23 82:2,3,6,8,10
18:5	58:22 64:2,18 67:15	32:11 33:11	82:11,18 83:2,7,17
rethink	roads	S	84:3,5
69:12	31:22,23 32:7 53:6,7	safe	schools
returning	55:11 56:13		77:15 78:4,18,20,22
52:9	roadway	29:18 30:5,13	79:1,3,11,14 80:1,13
revamped	28:11 30:4	safeguard 36:10	80:19 81:12,19 83:15
68:21	roadways		83:16 84:2,11
revenues	29:22 31:24,24 50:16	safety	School's
14:8 83:11	54:3 63:7	6:2,8,12 7:8,14 9:14	80:23 82:20
review	robust	18:11,19,21 19:6,17	Schwartz
5:20 6:15,18 7:2,16,18	61:24	31:19 32:16 33:8,14	3:3 84:22,24 87:17,21
8:10 9:1,8,15 15:15	rodent	43:12 48:12 50:14	88:5,19
39:10 58:24 60:7,19	42:18	53:14 85:11 89:7	screen
65:20 80:24 85:8	Roger	safety-based	16:12 18:4
89:8	3:1 70:12,14	53:2	se
reviewed	role	safe-harbor	74:15
13:7 39:6 59:2	53:20,21	72:1,14 73:13	search
reviewers	roles	sample	21:7,8
65:8	52:19	39:17	season
reviewing	roll	sanctuary	30:16 40:22
5:15 87:18	9:17	59:13,21 60:6,12 62:8	second
revisit	rolling	62:12,22 64:2,5,21	4:16 7:7 11:6 12:2
7:13	66:6	sand	19:17 21:4 22:17
revisiting	room	88:8	35:12,23 39:15 47:22
68:18	80:17 86:1	saw	47:23 48:6 81:9 83:2
re-adjust	Route	57:14 64:21	secondary
22:3	25:19	saying	53:6
right	rubbish	88:13	seconds

20:5,11	sequences	26:10	47:13
section	54:4	showed	site
13:24 35:21,24 36:4,9	serve	56:23	8:19,21,22 9:2 11:21
46:5,18 50:20 75:15	15:24 31:10,20 46:4	showing	12:1,19 15:10,24
sections	84:6	54:11 87:7,8	16:22 17:6 18:5,8,9
78:20	served	shows	30:1 37:9 43:17,24
sediment	16:24	20:13	44:12,20 45:14 46:17
35:23 36:22 38:7	serves	shuttle	47:3,10,16,20 48:9
sedimentation	31:6 42:8 70:15 81:5	33:20 34:17,19	49:2 52:2 53:1 54:1
36:1,6 38:9	service	side	54:8 56:22 57:20
1	21:13 33:20 34:17		
see 12:8 15:20 17:17 18:1		55:16,17 68:22 sides	59:8,11,13,20 62:4
	57:21 67:20		63:12 64:3,20 65:21
20:12,24 21:18 22:6	services	28:3 31:11	66:6 67:12 79:7
22:14 39:7,21 41:6	33:23 34:1,6 38:23	sideways	82:10 85:17 87:14
42:10,15 43:9 48:5	serving	67:19	88:16,22,23
54:24 55:6 58:4 76:8	53:12 60:15 66:24	sign	sited
seen	82:14	34:23	46:6 50:11
65:5	sessions	signals	sites
Selectman	5:9 86:20	29:12	74:5
76:17	set	signature	site's
selectmen	10:7 15:17 41:17 53:8	66:17	66:21
2:21 5:24 13:9 44:24	57:15 90:5	significant	site-based
45:6,10 48:14 49:6	setback	14:14 49:1 52:6 56:17	50:20
49:15 51:1	16:9,10,14	60:7 63:10 66:9	siting
Selkoe	setbacks	72:21 74:6,8 79:15	66:11 68:19
2:15 15:9,12,12	11:22 12:5 16:7 19:9	83:8	situated
semiprivate	47:14 48:2	significantly	16:20
55:17	sewage	68:7 81:21	situation
semi-private	62:14	Similar	24:9 25:7 26:6
54:5	sewer	33:9	situations
sense	38:20,22 39:1	Similarly	40:23
6:14 7:6 44:19 53:13	shade	34:22 53:19 67:6	size
sensitive	49:23	83:11 86:11	20:4
16:20 37:9 66:21	shades	simple	slide
sent	56:23 57:3	11:11	15:20 21:17 55:21,23
10:18 13:3	shading	simply	slides
separate	67:16	4:23 6:10 11:15 12:7	54:9
80:18	shared	12:12 43:23 46:13	slow
separately	55:12	single	25:21 66:6
8:1	short	28:4 82:20	small
separation	84:1	single-family	19:9 53:10,11 55:18
49:2	shorthand	16:2,6,8 50:3 67:2	71:12
September	90:7	68:5	smaller
77:20	shot	Sings	66:11
sequence	55:9	13:23	soil
55:9	show	sing-family	36:1,5
	MALO III	~ S	
I			

36:1,5	8:16 10:3 18:11,13,17	23:13,21 24:14,19	12:7
sole	24:1 45:7 58:4 70:18	25:3,11 26:19	station
11:2	76:19 77:7 84:22	stacking	21:16 22:8,13,18
solely	86:6	27:11	33:21
43:18	speaker	staff	stations
solids	13:13 30:19	5:8,14,19,22,24 33:2	22:7
37:12	speakers	51:3 70:4 75:11	statistics
solutions	18:10 74:13	82:18 85:2	46:10
82:7		82:18 83:2 standard	= ' =
	speaking		status 9:16 73:13
somebody 6:24 27:15	10:7 65:1 70:20 76:14 77:12	11:5 20:2,15 25:23	
		36:19 37:6	statute
Somerville	special	standards	45:23
34:23	40:3	20:7,8 21:14 22:19	Steinfeld
Somewhat	specific	35:13,16 36:19 38:1	2:13 5:4,7 8:17,24
47:23	37:23 58:9 60:13 65:9	38:4 39:5,8,11 61:1	13:14,15,15 43:5,7,7
sorry	67:14 88:17	standing	51:10 58:18 65:7
34:11 64:7	specifically	41:3 58:4	70:5,12 77:1 84:13
sorts	6:1 18:11 31:18 36:21	stands	Steven
4:11	40:1 44:3 79:12	51:1	3:3
sound	specimen	stark	stipulates
15:8 53:24 65:3	67:4	12:9	71:24
source	speed	start	stock
36:15 37:16,23 62:13	31:13 32:1	7:8 10:4 28:15	72:4,8 73:9
62:17	speeding	starting	stone
sources	28:18	35:19	66:17
4:11	spent	state	stood
South	67:12	13:6 15:19,22 51:24	48:22
1:8 22:16 32:23 81:13	spine	58:14 59:10,15,24	stop
southwest	53:12	63:14 69:8 71:17,21	19:23 35:3
68:22	spirit	72:4,8 73:1,17 75:22	stored
so-called	55:3	76:11	42:13
72:1 74:22	spite	stated	storm
space	55:1	11:20 33:22	35:22 62:11,13 64:1
17:13,18,21,24,24	splitting	statement	64:17,22
18:2 19:9 26:16	81:19	15:16	storms
44:17 49:1,18,23	spot	states	37:4
53:19 54:1,13,23	16:21 64:18	47:9	stormwater
55:12,17 57:17 66:7	spring	statewide	18:5 30:20 35:4,9,11
67:3 68:6,14,22	40:22	71:24	35:12,13,15,15 36:8
69:13,21 77:22 78:19	square	State's	36:12,14,16,18,20
81:8 82:13 85:23	81:8	71:20	37:1,10,18,20 38:13
spaces	squarely	State-approved	38:16 39:9 40:18,22
19:2 27:16 32:6,8 53:9	80:22	72:5	41:12 50:14 55:2
54:5 55:5,7,19 61:17	St	state-imposed	59:7,8 60:17,19 61:3
67:17	15:1,5 68:10 76:5	72:2	61:23 62:24 63:6,11
speak	stacked	stating	Storrs
•			

3:3	60:20 66:1	supportive	84:19 87:24
strain	subpar	61:7	taken
82:13	71:1	supports	16:19 18:18 29:17,19
strange	subsequently	43:16	31:14 56:8 90:4,7
45:15 46:22 71:8	78:9 79:6	supposed	takes
45.15 40.22 / 1.8 street	subsidized	70:22	19:22,22 29:24 44:18
1:11,16 15:2,6 28:3	14:23 45:16 46:23		19.22,22 29.24 44.16 Talerman
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		sure	
29:7,18 30:4 32:23	subsidizing 11:12	24:19 25:9 28:1 30:1,3	10:17,20
32:23 39:18 65:14		56:24 64:12 69:24	talk
67:20 68:11	substantial	surface	23:6 30:19 85:18 86:9
streets	81:17	36:23 39:18 62:2	88:3
27:24 53:15 54:18,21	substantiate	surfaces	talked
stretch	11:17	18:7 61:20	54:15
28:7	success	Surging	talking
stretched	43:17	83:18	19:5 88:4
83:18	successful	surprised	tall
strongly	14:22	64:8	16:23 47:15
61:6 86:11	successfully	surrounding	target
structure	78:18	43:14 47:19 49:9	41:22
79:8 81:20	sufficient	53:15	Taunton
structures	6:3 30:10	suspect	25:20
19:14 22:23 26:11,13	suggest	11:4	tax
49:5 69:2	12:11	suspended	79:23 80:3 83:8
stuck	suggestion	37:12 89:9	taxed
24:14	7:3	sustainable	50:2 85:20
student	suggests	44:3	taxpayer
77:17 81:3,9 83:21	82:11	swale	83:10
students	suitability	64:4	TDM
78:11,13 79:2,17	45:14 47:3	swath	34:5,11,23 35:6
80:13 81:5,8,22 82:1	Suite	16:3 66:23	team
82:4,5,12,15,18,20	1:16	sweeper	5:22
84:6	summary	61:19	technical
studios	38:18	sweeping	4:24,24 7:20,21 8:1
80:11,15	summer	61:19	68:20 85:9
study	40:22	system	ten
29:5 38:24 39:10	Superior	35:20 38:17 80:21	20:20,21 21:10
style	10:23	81:10,23 84:4	tenet
8:7	supply	systems	20:15
subjective	14:20 37:22 71:14	36:20,21 37:2,10	tenets
8:8 15:16	support	38:13	19:16 20:7
submit	40:15 44:23 48:19		terms
39:9 65:22	65:24 68:11	T	8:3 34:17 45:21 62:16
submittals	supported	table	71:13 72:11 86:15
4:12	68:8	83:4	test
submitted	supporting	take	38:22
4:14 40:14 41:9 47:22	75:17	6:6 29:5,8,20 76:20	testament
	, 5.17		
1			

48:23	Thornton	9:19 84:13	84:14
tested	34:15 53:7	top	town-initiated
18:6	thought	35:19 56:3	71:7
testimony	64:9	topography	town-owned
9:20 43:10 52:23	Thoughts	44:14 47:17 48:1 66:5	75:22
9.20 43.10 <i>32.23</i> 84:14,19	6:9	66:10	trades
The state of the s	thousand	total	32:12
testing	31:7	32:8 37:12 45:19 46:8	traffic
41:20,20 thank	three		
		46:24 63:13 71:12	6:2,8,11 7:8,13,18
6:4,5 9:4 13:11,12,15	6:7 7:7 20:10 31:21	72:3,7	9:14 17:3,9 18:11
27:4,7 30:21,24 39:3	34:3 42:7 79:10,14	totally	28:4 30:20 31:3,8,13
39:13 40:6 43:3,4,6	three-bedroom	54:21 88:14	31:16,22 32:15,16
45:7,8 51:8,9,14	80:10	touch	33:16 35:2,7,8 50:13
56:19,20 57:18 58:6	tight	83:16	53:3,16,18,24 82:17
58:17,20,23 63:19,22	25:20	touched	85:10 89:7
65:6,16 69:13 70:7	tighter	39:10	train
70:11 76:19,21,24	19:13	tour	34:24
77:6 84:11,12,15,17	time	21:20	transcript
84:17,24 85:1 88:24	6:3,12,13,15 7:1,6	town	90:6
89:4,8	8:20 9:7 12:24 20:5	1:10 2:12 5:8,11,14,19	transportation
thankfully	20:13,20 21:3,12	5:22,22,24 9:20	2:18 30:24 33:6,12,15
77:24	29:20 45:3 61:14	10:10 12:17,19,22	33:19,24
theory	65:22 76:14 78:4	13:7,17 14:4,11	travel
39:7	84:23 89:5 90:5	15:21 21:23,24 30:11	20:13,20
they'd	timeliness	32:23 33:7,12 34:24	treat
23:9	20:3	35:10,13,14 40:11	41:14
thing	timely	41:18,19 42:20 44:23	Treated
19:18 25:1 27:11	83:19	45:4,19,22 46:7 47:8	36:20
28:20 29:19	times	48:19 51:22 52:7	treatment
things	12:17 25:16,24 31:21	56:16 59:9,18,22	36:22 59:16
26:23 27:2,3 66:10	42:7	60:18 63:9 68:9 69:5	trees
76:16	title	69:6 71:1 73:23 74:4	16:3,12 18:3 49:23
think	10:5	74:19 75:8,10,11,17	55:1 66:8 67:4 68:6
4:22 6:23 7:6,24 8:5	TMDO	75:20,23 78:4 79:22	tremendous
8:11 9:7,9,10 20:21	63:13	81:22 83:8 85:2,7	84:10
22:2 27:10,14 28:15	today	87:8,11 88:2	trips
28:20,22 29:4,8,10	8:15 20:4 28:11 55:4	townhouse-style	32:3,9,10,12,13,14
29:16,19 30:10,13	today's	66:22 67:14	truck
40:2 54:24 55:21	79:17	towns	21:4 22:12,14,17
56:9,14 64:15,17,20	told	71:21 72:2 73:1,5,11	23:14,16
71:1 75:21 85:14	23:8 25:15 69:24	73:16	trucks
86:3 87:4,12	tonight	Town's	20:18 56:14
third	8:3 17:10 48:10 52:24	11:3 14:8 35:12,22	true
20:19 21:2	64:1 66:11 76:14	45:16 51:11,21 70:16	61:15 71:13 90:6
thirty	77:7,12	70:24 71:2,13 72:7	trust
20:10	tonight's	74:2 75:2,4 76:4	14:3,4 70:16 75:6
20.10	tonight s	17.2 13.2,7 10.7	17.3,7 10.10 13.0
	•	•	•

trustee	48:15	75:21	variance
70:16	unattractive	unwelcomed	39:12
trying	83:5	83:14	variations
28:13 87:24	underground	Updated	71:20
	19:2 67:9 69:1	32:20	
TSS 27.12	underlies		variety 4:10 57:2
37:13		upend 83:22	various
tuned	52:20		
41:9	underlying	urban	5:18 85:1
turn 52.11.79.2	48:17	5:20 6:2 9:8 31:6	varying
53:11 78:2	undermines	urge	38:1
turnaround	44:20 48:17	84:6	vectors
23:8,22 25:4 26:3	underpin	urges	41:1
turned	75:2	49:15	vehicle
67:19	understand	usage	27:18 32:10,12,21
turning	5:5 9:1,21	34:4	33:3 66:15
28:14	understanding	use	vehicles
twelve	87:17	25:18 29:2 37:8,14,18	27:17 31:7 32:4,8,13
21:5	understands	37:23 39:16 44:17	34:8,10,13 53:5
two	21:24	55:19 61:7,9 68:22	vehicular
10:24 20:18,24 21:17	unequivocally	69:12	33:7,13 44:18 49:3
23:20,20 31:9,11,21	11:20	useable	ventilation
32:9,17 33:21 34:3,9	Unfortunately	17:21 18:2 44:16	21:7
35:10 40:16 45:12	4:4 16:10	uses	versus
55:12 60:22 71:24	UNIDENTIFIED	32:17 35:10 37:15	11:8
72:10,21 78:4 81:19	64:23 65:2	44:1,7 49:3 61:12	veterans
two-and-a-half-story	uniform	71:8	52:10
15:23 18:24 88:10	71:21,24	utilities	VFW
two-bedroom	uniquely	38:19	28:6
80:10	81:20	utilization	viable
two-mile	units	34:8,10	68:23
22:13,18	13:20,23 14:1,6,17,23	utilize	vice
two-person	14:24 15:1,3 17:2	68:14,24 69:21	60:15
75:10	19:3 34:3,4 42:2,2	utmost	vicinity
two-school	45:17,19,24 46:3,8	20:5	32:24
81:2	46:12,21,21,22 47:1		video
type	47:2 50:22,23 53:13	V	20:24
67:18	54:4 55:16,18 65:19	vacant	videoing
types	66:4 69:19 72:6,20	46:14	39:2
40:24	73:18,19 74:1,3,9	vacuum	view
typically	75:14,15 76:3,6 80:9	61:19,19	85:19
31:24	80:9,10,10,12	valuable	viewpoint
	unrealistic	51:22 68:6 75:22	53:14
U	73:12	value	views
unacceptable	untreated	53:23 60:1	85:3
53:16	36:19	valued	vigorously
unanimously	unusual	75:24	48:14 51:6
,			

village	66:14	7:21 9:11,18 19:5,13	59:18 87:11
15:14 22:15 27:24	want	19:14,21 24:6,10,17	workload
31:11,20 32:5 33:1	8:5,14,16 24:7,23	24:18 25:3,9 28:17	19:24
46:19 47:7,12 48:16	26:22 34:2 45:10,12	41:2,7,11 42:15,21	works
48:18,20 49:9,11,17	54:9 84:17,22	47:3 61:9 62:5,6	4:5 14:20 30:8
50:6,15,22 51:22	wanted	82:14 85:4,6,11 86:6	World
52:4,5,20 53:2,15,17	8:2,13 85:1	86:19 88:7,13	52:10
54:2,7 55:13 65:19	wants	we've	worse
68:15 69:22 72:15	56:16	8:3 25:15 26:22 27:1	23:5
73:21 74:5,10,18	War	28:10 30:11 41:18	wrote
76:10 77:14 80:7	52:10	42:19 82:6 86:12,18	21:22,23 69:16
81:2,6,14 82:21	Washington	whatsoever	
virtually	1:11	85:22 86:15	Y
48:6 53:22	wasn't	white	yards
visit	23:18	54:11	66:14
64:3	water	who've	Yeah
visitors	36:23 37:10,22 40:18	85:8	6:23 7:24 8:14
32:12	41:3 59:21 60:2	wide	year
visual	Watershed	16:5 17:1	14:10 20:10 39:19,20
50:12	59:9,23 63:9,16	widely	47:4 72:8 73:15,20
visually	way	18:6	73:20,20 74:1 82:8
43:19	4:4 9:24 22:18 24:18	width	yearly
vitally	24:22 25:2,8,22 27:2	16:11,13	74:3
77:11	27:3 28:6 44:2 50:6	wildlife	years
volume	56:19 57:9 68:3	42:18	25:23 48:22 61:5
1:1 28:12,12,13 30:6	73:23 81:1	willing	62:16 64:24 77:16
31:22	week	69:3	78:4,7,14 82:8 85:21
volumes	4:17 42:8	willingness	young
31:24	welcome	75:21	28:17
voted	56:17 87:10	winds	
51:23 77:19 79:9	welfare	64:20	Z
vouchers	36:6	withdrawn	Zarrillo
46:6,18 50:20	well-designed	47:22	2:24 65:10,12,13 70:8
	49:11	wondering	ZBA
oxdot	went	7:17 70:2	49:13
waiting	21:19	wooded	Zipcar
21:10	west	67:8	33:21
waivers	64:9	words	Zipcars
4:18,19	wetland	84:18	34:7
walk	59:4,13,21	work	zone
29:18	wetlands	5:9 29:11 45:1 46:16	16:1 64:4 67:1 86:6,10
walking	36:24 41:5 62:21	51:1 55:3 69:11 78:2	zones
28:16	we'll	85:9 87:8,12	80:24
walk-around	8:21 21:17 41:20 42:3	worked	zoning
22:22	88:24	69:7	1:5 4:5 5:15 13:19,24
walls	we're	working	74:24 87:1,6 88:18

88:19,20	50:23 64:24 72:3	1946	234
88:19,20 Zuroff	78:7		32:8
		12:19 48:18 86:5,7	
2:6 10:1 39:4,13	10.6	1996	24
	80:5	13:23	14:24 25:19
\$11	100	1997	24-hour
•	13:21 16:5 32:14	14:7	37:4
14:7 75:7	100-plus	2	25
\$12	73:24		74:2
79:23	100-year	2	26th
\$4	37:4	31:21 37:4 73:1	6:1,13 9:12,13 10:19
75:18	110	2nd	12:21 89:5
\$5	46:4	5:9,17,21 6:21 70:3	26,000-plus
14:10	116	2,118	72:20 73:18
\$5.6	17:1	45:17	26,200
79:24	12	2,337	45:20
\$555,000	16:4 18:23	46:8	28
14:11	13	2,500	80:9,9
\$6	31:7	79:17 82:4,12,20,22	29
76:5	130	20	76:17
\$6.4	73:19	71:12 76:9	
14:2	139	200	3
	81:8	45:24 80:12	3
0	143	2005	32:15 37:7 73:1 90:11
02111	32:5	78:11	3,000
1:17	144	2007	41:13
02445	19:2	11:7	3,886
1:12	15	2008	78:11
	13:20 17:22 18:1 31:7	78:3,16	3.87
1	73:11	2009	20:19
1	153	31:16 32:22	30
19:11 32:19 36:19	46:20	2010	20:4 31:13 34:10
72:7 73:1,14,18	16	45:20	39:18,19
1,300	32:24	2011	300
78:11	17th	13:1 31:16	46:5,18 75:14
1,800	90:8	2012	31
79:17 82:4	179	11:19 52:1	32:21,24
1,918	1:16	2013	32
45:24	18	32:22 76:17 77:20	15:3
1,957		20130094	32-unit
47:1	17:1	1:6	75:19
1-90	192	2014	333
1:2	19:2 34:3 46:22 53:13	1:9 90:8	1:11
1.5	65:18 80:8	2017	34
19:4	1930s		76:2
10	52:13	90:11	
37:4 39:11 45:22	1940s	2022	35
	55:5	79:22 82:3	78:12
	I	I	I

			Page 31
250	50.6	142	
350	52:6	4:2	
50:22	5	- 70	
351	5	- 76:2,8 80:10	
71:20	1:9 22:18 37:14	700	
353	5,228	82:17	
46:24	78:12	74	
36	50	16:23	
15:1	16:9 18:5 31:12	754	
377	50,000	81:5	
32:8	75:8	78	
39	500	45:17	
46:21	28:15 46:11	8	
4	52	$\frac{3}{8}$	
4.25	32:23	38:6 45:21 46:5,18	
4.25 21:4	52:25 53	50:20 72:20 75:15	
4.8	50:19	80	
4.8 13:24	50:19 530	37:11	
13:24 40		85th	
25:23 34:9	16:17		
23:23 54:9 40B	542-0039 1:18	31:13 874	
	542-2119		
1:7 11:10 12:15 15:19		78:13	
45:16,21 46:10,11,22	1:18	9	
50:18 67:24 70:21,23	59	9	
71:3,8,15,24 73:10	76:6	_ 46:9 72:23	
74:19 77:14 78:15	6	9:26	
80:6 83:12,22 40B's	$\frac{3}{6}$	89:9	
72:2	22:8,8 66:13	90	
	6th	73:16	
40s	1:11	900	
52:14	60	75:14	
400 16:17 32:4	76:6,8	95	
	600	73:16	
401	19:5 27:22 28:15	96	
1:16 402	617	13:23	
402 19:3	1:18,18	13.23	
19:3 42	679		
78:19	81:8		
78:19 44			
25:19	7		
25:19 46	7		
52 :6	14:1 32:19		
468	7:00		
	1:9 89:5		
32:10,13 49	7:27		
47			
	I	Í	I